

R003444244

WORLD CONFERENCE
ON FAITH AND ORDER

Continuation Committee

Blind-stamped red stamp

WORLD COUNCIL
OF CHURCHES

Commission on Faith and Order

MEETINGS AT
AMSTERDAM AND BAARN, HOLLAND

August—September, 1948

Issued by the Commission

7 Kensington Church Court,
London, W.8,
England.

St. John's Rectory,
Washington, Conn.,
U.S.A.

Old Series, No. 103
New Series, No. 1

LIBRARY

World Council of Churches

17, route de Malagnou, GENEVA

LIBRARY

World Council of Churches

Geneva, GENEVA

CONTENTS

	PAGE
LAST MEETING OF THE EDINBURGH CONFERENCE (1937) CONTINUATION COMMITTEE	5
ADDRESS BY THE RT. REV. YNGVE T. BRILIOTH, D.D., Bishop of Växjö, at the First Assembly of the World Council of Churches	12
FIRST MEETING OF THE COMMISSION ON FAITH AND ORDER OF THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES:	17
List of Members Present	17
Business Sessions	19
Conference Sessions	27
Index of Resolutions Passed	66
CONSTITUTION	67
LIST OF MEMBERS	73
COMMITTEES AND THEOLOGICAL COMMISSIONS ...	77
LIST OF PUBLICATIONS	78

WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER

Continuation Committee AMSTERDAM

Saturday, August 21st, 1948, 2.30 p.m.

The following were recorded as present at this meeting:—

Officers :

- RT. REV. YNGVE T. BRILIOTH, D.D., Bishop of Växjö, *Chairman.*
REV. DR. R. NEWTON FLEW, *Vice-Chairman.*
REV. DR. L. HODGSON, *Theological and General Secretary.*
REV. DR. FLOYD W. TOMKINS, *Associate Secretary in America.*
REV. O. S. TOMKINS, *Assistant Secretary.*
REV. PROF. D. M. BAILLIE, *Chairman of the Commission on
Intercommunion, European Section.*
PROF. DR. G. VAN DER LEEUW, *Chairman of the Commission on
Ways of Worship.*

Members :

- Professor H. S. Alivisatos.
Pastor Hans Asmussen, D.D.
Rev. Dr. M. E. Aubrey, C.H.
Prof. Dr. S. F. H. J. Berkelbach van der Sprenkel.
Prof. Dr. P. Boendermaker.
Baron C. W. Th. van Boetzelaer van Dubbeldam.
Howard H. Brinton.
Professor Henri Clavier.
Commissioner A. G. Cunningham.
Bischof D. Dr. Otto Dibelius.
Rev. Prof. C. H. Dodd, D.D.
Rev. W. E. Garrison, D.D.
Rev. Bishop Ivan Lee Holt, D.D.

Prof. D. Adolf Keller, D.D.
Professor Atkinson Lee, M.A.
Rev. Dr. A. J. Macdonald.
Rev. Dr. John A. Mackay.
Rev. Dr. John Marsh.
Rev. Hugh Martin, D.D.
Rt. Rev. Bishop G. Ashton Oldham, D.D.
Rev. E. A. Payne, B.Litt.
Very Rev. George C. Pidgeon, M.A., D.D.
C. T. Le Quesne, K.C.
Rev. Kenneth Riches.
Principal William Robinson, M.A., D.D.
Professor Jean de Saussure.
Prof. D. Ernst Staehelin.
Rt. Rev. Mar Theodosius, O.I.C.
Professor Bela Vasady, D.D.
Rev. A. R. Wentz, Ph.D., D.D.

Substitute :

Rev. Martti L. Parvio (for the Most Rev. Archbishop A. Lehtonen).

Member of Commission :

W. Vos, Esq.

OPENING BUSINESS.

The Right Rev. Bishop Yngve T. Brilioth, Chairman, opened the meeting with prayer. He then said that at this last meeting of the Edinburgh Continuation Committee they would be fully occupied with the business before them and would not expect any elaborate address from him. But he must say a personal word of appreciation of his election as Chairman. When he received the invitation, he felt that it was a terrifying prospect to step into the place of Charles Henry Brent and William Temple. But it was a clear call of duty and he was prepared to do what he could, hoping that the Committee would forgive his deficiencies and trusting in their support and patience.

They met at a critical point in their history. Faith and Order was not indeed to be merged in the World Council of Churches so as to disappear and lose its individuality, but to be united with a true hope for the future as partner with other branches of the œcumenical movement. They believed that they had been guided by God and it was good to note that, under God, no one had done more for the union than William Temple. They were confident that their traditions would be respected and that they would have a fair deal. Faith and Order had its own gifts of which he hoped to say something to the World Council Assembly next day. What plans they should make for the future would have to be considered when they met at Baarn as the World Council's Commission on Faith and Order.

Apologies for absence were presented from the following:—The Rt. Rev. Bishop Eivind Berggrav, Very Rev. E. J. Hagan, Rev. Prof. R. R. Hartford, Professor Charles Hauter, Carl Heath, Rev. Dr. J. T. Hornsby, Rt. Rev. Bishop Dr. Adolf Küry, Most Rev. Archbishop A. Lehtonen, Rev. Prof. W. Manson, Prof. D. Dr. Károly Pröhle, Rt. Rev. A. E. J. Rawlinson, Bishop of Derby, Mrs. E. A. Stebbins.

The Committee stood while the Secretary read the following list of members and fellow-workers whose deaths had been reported since August, 1947:—Prof. D. Dr. Martin Dibelius, Prof. D. Dr. G. Hermelink, Prof. André Jundt, Rev. Dr. A. R. Kepler, Dr. John H. MacCracken, Rev. Elias Marmura, Rev. J. S. Murray, Pastor Charles Merle d'Aubigné, Rev. Dr. J. H. Rushbrooke, Domprobst Dr. P. Simon.

The Secretary reported that Bishop Stören of the Church of Norway and Dr. Hagan of the Church of Scotland had expressed their intention to resign their membership of the Committee in order to make room for younger men.

The Secretary announced that by the generosity of Mrs. Edwin Allen Stebbins, fifty copies of the recently published life of Bishop Brent had been received for presentation to his friends on the Committee. The Committee expressed its appreciation and thanks for this gift.

SECRETARY'S REPORT.

My first duty, when we adjourned a year ago, was a very happy one: to write to Bishop Brilioth and inform him of our unanimous wish that he should be our Chairman. Before long I received from him the good news of his acceptance of the office, and so his election could be included in the minutes of last year's meeting. Those minutes were printed in Switzerland, and copies posted to all our members who could be reached. The brief report of our doings on the card sent out in connection with the January "Week of Prayer" was posted to the nearly two thousand names on my mailing list.

Last summer's meeting, the first since 1939, has been followed by increased activity on the part of our three Commissions, of which more will be heard when we meet at Baarn a fortnight hence. I have been able to be present during part of the time at meetings of the Ways of Worship Commission in April and of the Intercommunion Commission in May. But my own work for Faith and Order has had to be concerned mainly with preparations for our integration into the structure of the World Council of Churches, with preparation, that is, for our meeting this afternoon.

During the autumn I received indications that some of our members were anxious lest in the organisation of the World Council our status as one of the co-equal partners in its foundation should be overlooked. In consequence of this I wrote a memorandum recalling the history of the formative years and expressing what I understood to be the expectations of the members of this Committee on its becoming the World Council's Commission on Faith and Order. I showed this to some of my fellow-officers on this Committee and on the World Council Provisional Committee. From the latter I received assurances that our position was understood and that the plans being made were in accordance with our expectations, and I was asked to draft a constitution for our future organisation. This has to conform to the conditions

laid down in 1937 by the Edinburgh Conference and yet to be adapted to the circumstances of to-day when so much has happened that was then unforeseen. As a guide to what was required I was given a copy of the constitution proposed for another organ of the World Council. The result of my efforts was circulated to all our members in June. Copies are in your hands for discussion this afternoon, and I have notes of comments received by post from members unable to be with us to-day.

The Treasurer's Report shows that we have kept our expenditure within our budget; we shall be able to enter into the World Council as a bride with a dowry.

As I foreshadowed in my report a year ago, the consummation of this marriage will be the time for me to lay down the general secretaryship of this Committee. I have recently been re-reading my correspondence with Archbishop Temple at the time of my original appointment in 1933. At that time this Committee had a full-time general secretary, a layman with an office in Geneva, and decided to employ in addition a part-time theological secretary; that was the post to which I was appointed. A month or two later the Archbishop wrote again to say that owing to the world financial crisis the Movement found itself temporarily in difficulties; it would have to dispense with its general secretary, would I, for the time being, look after his duties on a voluntary basis? So for these fifteen years I have been your professional theological secretary and your amateur general secretary. If the Committee should wish to revert to the original arrangement of my first few months and retain me as theological secretary, I shall be happy to serve it to the best of my ability, but I must now recognise the fact that my other duties are incompatible with continuance as general secretary.

I cannot lay down that office without taking this opportunity of expressing my gratitude for all that it has brought me, for the enriching of my understanding of our Christian Faith through insight into what it means to fellow-Christians of other traditions, and for all the joy of personal friendships, and for the kindness which I have received from all the other officers and members of this Committee, the support which they have never failed to give me in all that I have tried to do, the patience with which they have borne with my failings and mistakes. If I were to begin to mention by name, from our chairmen downwards, those whom I feel I want to thank, I should have to go on till there was no time left for the very important business which this meeting has to transact this afternoon.

FINANCE.

The Treasurer's report was received.

A proposed budget of expenditure for the coming year was laid before the Committee. (See below p. 23.)

On the motion of Dr. Macdonald, seconded by Bishop Oldham, the following resolution was passed:—

“The Faith and Order Continuation Committee gives general approval to the proposed budget of expenditure for the coming year; it authorises its Executive Committee to make internal adjustments, where necessary, so long as the sum total be not exceeded; and it requests the Central Committee to approve this as the budget of expenditure for the World Council's Commission on Faith and Order.”

CONSTITUTION.

The Committee then took into consideration the draft, previously circulated, of a proposed constitution for the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches. This was discussed, paragraph by paragraph, together with comments and proposals for amendment which had been received from members who could not be present. Various amendments were made, and finally it was unanimously agreed that the constitution, as amended, be approved.

CO-OPTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS.

It was unanimously agreed to co-opt the following to membership of the Committee:—

Howard H. Brinton, Religious Society of Friends of Philadelphia and Vicinity.

Bishop D. Ordass, Evangelical Lutheran Church of Hungary.

Bishop J. Smemo of Agder, Church of Norway.

It was unanimously agreed that the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches be asked to approve the appointment of the Rev. Oliver S. Tomkins as General Secretary of the Council's Commission on Faith and Order, subject to nomination in proper form being made by the Commission at its first meeting to be held at Baarn on September 7th.

On the proposal of Dr. Flew, it was agreed that the following be added to the membership of the Theological Commission on the Church and be invited to the meeting to be held at Baarn on September 7th and 8th:—

Principal

Prof. Kenneth S. Latourette
Prof. Walter M. Horton
Dr. W. E. Garrison
Dean Eric H. Wahlstrom
Prof. Clarence T. Craig
Dr. George W. Richards
Dr. George C. Pidgeon

Alternate

Pres. Harold W. Tribble
Dr. Douglas Horton
Dean Alfred T. DeGroot
Prof. Theodore G. Tappert
Dr. B. Harvie Branscomb
Pres. John A. Mackay
Prof. John Dow

CONCLUSION.

The Chairman said it was a solemn moment. They could not close the last meeting of the Continuation Committee without looking back in thankfulness for all that this Committee had meant and for all the work that it had done and for the two great men who had guided it, Brent and Temple. They had indeed been blessed by the Holy Ghost and they closed with thanks for past blessings and hopes that their future work would be as richly blessed.

He then closed the meeting with the benediction at 4.45 p.m.

WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES AMSTERDAM ASSEMBLY

ADDRESS BY THE RIGHT REV. YNGVE T. BRILIOTH, BISHOP OF VÄXJÖ, *at the opening meeting of the first Assembly of the World Council of Churches on Sunday, August 22nd, 1948. On the following morning the World Council was formally constituted, and the Continuation Committee of the Edinburgh Conference (1937) became the World Council's Commission on Faith and Order.*

When, in 1937, the Conferences of Oxford and Edinburgh decided to approve the report of the Committee of 35 which had been worked out during a memorable session at Westfield College, Hampstead, the idea of a World Council of Churches took concrete form. It was then conceived as a common organisation within which the two movements of Faith and Order and Life and Work should continue their activities. As it stands to-day, and as it will probably emerge from this Assembly, the World Council is more than a mere union of these two movements. But in order to understand its origin, and to safeguard its inheritance, it is necessary to keep in mind the character of its original components.

Of these Faith and Order is the older. It is well known that it owes its origin to the Episcopal Church in America. The inspiration came from the World Missionary Conference, held in Edinburgh, in 1910, and it was mediated above all by one man: Charles Brent, who was then Bishop of the Philippine Islands. According to his recent biography, the Bishop records in his diary that at the early Eucharist on the opening day of the General Convention of his Church, held in Cincinnati in 1910, there came upon him vividly a conviction that a world conference should be convened to consider matters of faith and order. The preamble to the resolution of the General Convention which actually called the movement into being contains the principles which have guided its course: "With grief for our aloofness in the past, and for other faults of pride and self-sufficiency which make for schisms; with loyalty to the truth as we see it, and with respect for the convictions of those who differ from us; holding the belief that the beginnings of unity are to be found in the clear statement and full consideration of those

things in which we differ, as well as those things in which we are at one, we respectfully submit the following resolution". The invitation went out to "all Christian Communion throughout the world which confess our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour"—that is the basis which has been taken in the constitution of the World Council which we have to consider here in Amsterdam.

The invitation was carried with enthusiasm by emissaries of the Protestant Episcopal Church to churches in various parts of the world, and met with an encouraging response. That the Church of Rome, through its supreme head, refused to participate was a disappointment that could have been foreseen. It is not my task to tell the further story of the Movement. To many here present it is well known. Others might need a fuller statement than can be given here. The history of the Movement as a whole is not yet written. It would have to tell of the first tentative, somewhat rambling discussions at the Preparatory Conference, held in Geneva in 1920, when the first Continuation Committee was appointed, of the preparations for the Lausanne Conference, and of the full and weighty discussions of that impressive gathering at which the real difficulties of the work emerged, but also the urgency of the task became apparent. It was natural that the early phase of the Movement should be characterised by its Anglican origin. In the material prepared for the Lausanne Conference the ideal of a reunited Church sometimes appeared as a tangible possibility that might be realised in a not too distant future. It was necessary that the real depth of the difficulties should be fathomed, and the problems revised in the light of a wider experience. We met then, as in Geneva, under the leadership of Bishop Charles Brent. He was ably and forcibly assisted by the Vice-Chairman, Dr. A. E. Garvie. When Bishop Brent passed away in 1929, in Lausanne, in the same city where he had given the last of his strength in the cause of unity—although very few of the members of the Conference knew it—the chairmanship of the Continuation Committee was entrusted to William Temple, then Archbishop of York, and to many of us the later history, down to 1939, is the history of his leadership. The meetings of the Committee under him became not mere business sessions, but continuations, in a real sense, of the work of the Conference. It is impossible to deny that there had been, not least during and after the Lausanne Conference, a certain feeling of rivalry between Faith and Order and Life and Work, although many recognised that if Stockholm had not gone before, Lausanne would have had much harder work. It gradually became clear that the border-line between the two Movements was partly

artificial. The problems of life and work were seen to depend on the principles of faith, and Faith and Order could not in the long run stop short of action. Perhaps also within Faith and Order a certain tension could be observed between a conservative group that firmly adhered to the original programme, and others who were apt to become a little impatient with the merely academic study of differences and agreements, and looked for a bolder policy. It was, as far as I can see, largely through William Temple's generous breadth of vision, and his prophetic gift of combining theory and practice that these difficulties were overcome—and a way was opened that led to the formation of the World Council of Churches. The report of the 35 which was laid before the Conferences of Oxford and Edinburgh had been worked out under his guidance, and its acceptance by the second Conference on Faith and Order was made possible by his personal authority and the confidence which he inspired.

When Faith and Order to-day enters the World Council, the situation has changed in many ways since 1937. Faith and Order has during the intervening period continued its work in spite of great difficulties, almost only through its commissions. Its central staff has been entirely inadequate. Our Theological Secretary, who had generously undertaken to shoulder also the burden of General Secretary, has not been relieved as he had a right to expect. On the other hand, the urgent tasks of the post-war period have given great prominence to activities that fall within the sphere of Life and Work. Its Geneva office has grown into the impressive and immensely active secretariat of the World Council—in process of formation. The various trends in œcumenical history have been intertwined in many ways that could not be foreseen. The close co-operation with the International Missionary Council is an important new fact which transcends earlier divisions.

Those who came to this Assembly without a personal experience of the earlier phases of the Movement may perhaps ask: What is the use of Faith and Order? Which are the peculiar gifts that Faith and Order has to bring to the World Council? I believe that there are such gifts—of great importance. One of them is a personal tradition, a valuable tradition from our founders and fathers. The name of Charles Brent commands universal respect and veneration. He carried with him, in his manifold activities, that strange, lucid serenity which is one of the marks of saintliness. The untiring zeal of the first General Secretary, R. H. Gardiner, should not be forgotten, nor the faithful labour of Dean H. N. Bate, the editor of the Lausanne Report. To William

Temple, as to Charles Brent, the quest of unity was a commanding passion. Sorely as we miss his personal presence, his work and his personality are an abiding inspiration. Many other names could be added. I venture to mention only three: Bishop A. C. Headlam, who gave so much of his energy to the theological work of Faith and Order, and expressed so strongly his concern for its future; Dr. William Adams Brown, who carried into the Movement the scholarly tradition of American Protestantism; and Professor Adolf Deissmann, who embraced with equal fidelity the ideals of both Movements, and would have rejoiced at their union.

The second gift, in a sense derived from the first, is a certain temperament that can better be felt than defined. It may be described as a sincere willingness to speak the truth in love—to take differences seriously, but at the same time to see to the motives rather than to their expression, to look for the hidden unity in the apparent diversity, to honour all genuine forms of Christian thought and practice. It has been the conviction of the leaders of the Movement that theological work is certainly worth while, although the practical results may be very slow to emerge. This peculiar temperament has been in a certain sense academic, but the scholars' task has been illumined by the vision of the one Church, holy, catholic and apostolic, a vision that has convinced us of its eternal reality, although its external realisation may recede into a distant future, even beyond the confines of time and eternity.

Thirdly, we may point to agreements that have been reached, and studies that have been fruitfully accomplished. The mighty volumes on the doctrine of Grace and on the Ministry and the Sacraments are achievements of which full use has not yet been made. It is to be hoped that the three commissions which are at present at work, on the doctrine of the Church, on the ways of worship and on inter-communion, will produce reports that may be of real importance for the Church universal. There are in the reports of the two Conferences pages that stand out as documents of unquestionable value. I venture to call attention to the Report of Section II. of the Lausanne Conference: "The Church's Message to the World—the Gospel", which expresses the common mind of the Conference more clearly perhaps than any other of its pronouncements, and is perhaps the most successful attempt that has been made to express the fundamental verities of our Faith in the language of our own time. I want to mention also the chapter on Grace in the Edinburgh Report; here, it seems, the fundamental

common convictions of Catholics and Protestants have found expression in a statement that can be called really œcumenical, and finally "The Affirmation of Union in Allegiance to Our Lord Jesus Christ", which was adopted at the same Conference of 1937:

"We are convinced that our unity of spirit and aim must be embodied in a way that will make it manifest to the world, though we do not yet clearly see what outward form it should take.

We believe that every sincere attempt to co-operate in the concerns of the Kingdom of God draws the severed communions together in increased mutual understanding and goodwill. We call upon our fellow-Christians of all communions to practise such co-operation; to consider patiently occasions of disunion that may be overcome; to be ready to learn from those who differ from them; to seek to remove those obstacles to the furtherance of the Gospel in the non-Christian world which arise from our divisions; and constantly to pray for that unity which we believe to be our Lord's will for His Church."

That is the temperament and the aim of Faith and Order. Those are its gifts to the Church universal, and to the World Council of Churches. In order to be able to bring these gifts in future, Faith and Order must have liberty to pursue its work patiently. It should not be hurried. It must remain true to its principles, true to its inheritance. It has a right to expect from the Council the support it will need for its work, and from the various branches and activities within the Council the sympathy and understanding that can strengthen its confidence.

The World Council would be poorer without Faith and Order. It is one of the pillars on which the Council is constructed. The World Council needs its constant reminder that mere co-operation is not unity; that practical activity must proceed from the deep motives of faith; that diversities of thought and order and devotional forms cannot be ignored, but should be made the object of patient study in order to discover the fundamental convictions which they embody, and in which alone they can be reconciled. It should be the task of Faith and Order to keep alive in the World Council the spirit of pilgrimage, to point steadily to the farther goal, the great vision which, even if it should not be fully realised in time, should be in all our earthly and temporal endeavours, the constant inspiration.

WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES
Commission on Faith and Order
BAARN, HOLLAND
September 7th and 8th, 1948

The following were recorded as present during these sessions:—

Officers :

- RT. REV. YNGVE T. BRILIOTH, D.D., Bishop of Växjö, *Chairman*.
REV. DR. R. NEWTON FLEW, *Vice-Chairman*.
MOST REV. ARCHBISHOP GERMANOS, *Vice-Chairman*.
REV. O. S. TOMKINS, *Secretary*.
REV. DR. L. HODGSON, *Theological Secretary*.
REV. DR. FLOYD W. TOMKINS, *Associate Secretary in America*.
REV. PROF. D. M. BAILLIE, *Chairman of the Commission on Inter-
communion European Section*).

Members :

- Professor H. S. Alvisatos.
Rev. Canon H. K. Archdail.
Rev. Dr. M. E. Aubrey, C.H.
Prof. Dr. P. Boendermaker.
Baron C. W. Th. van Boetzelaer van Dubbeldam.
Howard H. Brinton.
Professor H. Clavier.
Commissioner A. G. Cunningham.
Prof. Dr. Franz Fischer.
Very Rev. Archpriest Dr. G. Florovsky.
Rev. Dr. W. J. Gallagher.
Rev. Dr. W. E. Garrison.
Rev. Professor R. R. Hartford, D.D.
Rev. A. Wellesley Jones, B.D.
Professor W. J. Kooiman.
C. T. Le Quesne, K.C.
Rev. Dr. A. J. Macdonald.
Rev. Dr. John Marsh.

Pastor Pierre Maury.
Rev. E. A. Payne, B.Litt.
Rev. Kenneth Riches.
Professor Jean de Saussure.
Professor D. Ernst Staehelin.
Rt. Rev. Mar Theodosius, O.I.C.
Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft.
Rt. Rev. Edward S. Woods, D.D., Bishop of Lichfield.

Substitutes :

Percy W. Bartlett (for Carl Heath).
Rev. Martti L. Parvio (for Most Rev. Archbishop A. Lehtonen).

Members of Theological Commissions :

Professor Clarence T. Craig.
Professor Walter M. Horton.
W. Vos, Esq.
Professor L. A. Zander.

Visitors :

Mrs. Alivisatos.
Mrs. Newton Flew.
Mrs. Hartford.
Miss Isis N. Kelada.
Rev. K. Philipos.
Rev. Dr. Hans Schönfeld.
Rev. K. M. Simon.
Rev. Canon Frank Woods.

On the two mornings prayers were led by the Rev. Dr. W. E. Garrison and Professor Jean de Saussure; the closing devotions were conducted by the Rt. Rev. Mar Theodosius and the Chairman.

BUSINESS SESSIONS.

THE CHAIRMAN opened proceedings by saying that this was the first meeting of the World Council's Commission on Faith and Order. The Edinburgh Continuation Committee had held its last meeting on August 21st and now, the conditions laid down at Edinburgh having been fulfilled, it became the World Council's Commission. There was no change of personnel, they were old friends and colleagues who had a Constitution provisionally approved by the World Council's Central Committee which had agreed that the Continuation Committee should be taken over complete with its officers and Executive Committee.

What they had to do now was to consider the implications of the new status. Wherein did the newness consist? They were now part of the World Council which was no longer in process of formation, but was a fact. It would take time to realise all the implications of that fact for the Churches, but for this great fact they must give thanks to God from the depths of their hearts and ask His blessing.

What did it mean for Faith and Order? It meant relief from the burden of much responsibility for external organisation and finance. Moreover, they would have a whole-time Secretary; they welcomed Oliver Tomkins to this office; he was no stranger and they could look forward to his being with them for at least two years. And the fellowship opened to them in the World Council should mean something more than a formal association, it should be an inspiration. There was no need to dwell on their continuity with the past, their heritage from Lausanne and Edinburgh and memories of their past leaders. That was secure in all their minds. But fidelity to the past did not mean remaining for ever in once accepted forms of thought and action; they could be true to the past only by remaining open to new demands. There was no opposition between the old and the new. Amsterdam had made clear the World Council's need of Faith and Order for its own sake and they could best serve the World Council by remaining true to their own traditions and principles. They came in in no spirit of suspicion, but filled with hope and a deep sense of the opportunity now given them to make their work fruitful in the whole field of œcumenical activities. That was the most inspiring feature of the new status.

He need not repeat what he had said at the last meeting of his feeling of his own inadequacy, mingled with gratitude for the position of trust the Committee had given him. He need not enlarge upon these personal matters, but begged for the continued patience of the Commission and prayed that God would bless their work in the future as in the past.

THE REV. O. S. TOMKINS said he was grateful for the opportunity of expressing his appreciation of the honour done to him. The World Council was now a fact; it meant that the Churches were pledged to stay together. Their future work would be done in the context of deep mutual commitment of the Churches as such, and in that context they could make their contribution.

In accepting the office of Secretary, he had set a term of two years for two reasons: (i) the World Council had to beware of the danger of breeding whole-time, long-term œcumenical bureaucrats. There must be some, but the fewer the better. He himself wanted to get back to parish work, but his experience of Faith and Order since he first came in in the youth group, and more recent experience of other World Council activities, made him realise that he must accept the post. (ii) They would be preparing for a Conference on Faith and Order in four or five years, but the immediate task was to knit Faith and Order into the World Council as one of its co-founders. Two years would enable him to do this and then hand it over in time for a new man to organise the Conference. For the moment, he felt that he wanted to sit back and listen before making definite suggestions of what Faith and Order could contribute to the whole life of the World Council through having its own full-time agent. Their main work must be in their Theological Commissions, but what more could they do for the hundred and fifty churches in the Council?

Apologies for absence were presented from the following:—The Rev. Prof. G. C. Barber, B.D., Rt. Rev. Bishop Eivind Berggrav, D.D., Prof. Dr. S. F. H. J. Berkelbach van der Sprengel, Rt. Rev. D. B. Blackwood, Bishop of Gippsland, Rev. Dr. S. McCrea Cavert, Very Rev. E. J. Hagan, D.D., O.B.E., Prof. Charles Hauter, Carl Heath, Rev. Bishop Ivan Lee Holt, D.D., Rev. Dr. J. T. Hornsby, Rev. Dr. Douglas Horton, Prof. D. Adolf Kellier, D.D., Rt. Rev. Bishop Dr. Adolf Kury, Prof. Dr. G. van der Leeuw, Most Rev. Archbishop A. Lehtonen, D.Theol., Dr. William B. Lippard, Rev. Canon I. Luka, Rev. Alexander McCrea, Rev. Dr. Homer McMillan, Rev. Prof. W. Manson, D.D., Pastor Lic. Wilhelm Niesel, Rt. Rev.

Bishop G. Ashton Oldham, D.D., Rt. Rev. Bishop E. J. Palmer, D.D., Very Rev. George C. Pidgeon, D.D., Prof. D. Dr. Károly Pröhle, Rt. Rev. A. E. J. Rawlinson, D.D., Bishop of Derby, Professor Harold Roberts, Bischof D. Wilhelm Stählin, Mrs. E. A. Stebbins, Professor Bela Vasady, Rev. Dr. A. R. Wentz, Pastor Charles Westphal.

CONSTITUTION.

The Constitution for the Commission, as approved on August 21st, had been considered by the World Council Central Committee which had given it provisional approval, subject to agreement on certain proposed amendments. These had been discussed by the Executive Committee, which also suggested a few further points for revision. These were discussed by the Commission. Certain amendments were agreed to and the Constitution, as amended, was approved for submission to the Council for its final adoption. (See below, page 67.)

ELECTIONS.

THE CHAIRMAN reported that the World Council's Central Committee had appointed the Rev. Oliver S. Tomkins as Secretary of the Commission on the nomination of the Continuation Committee made on August 21st.

The Commission then passed the following Resolution:—

Whereas it appears that under Clause VI. (a) of the Constitution of the World Council of Churches and Clause 6 of the Constitution of this Commission on Faith and Order the Commission now consists of the Continuation Committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order appointed at Edinburgh in 1937 together with its officers, Executive Committee and Theological Commissions, the Commission resolves as follows:—

- (i) That the Rt. Rev. Bishop Yngve T. Brilioth be re-elected as Chairman.
- (ii) That the following be elected as Vice-Chairmen:
The Rt. Rev. Bishop Aulén
Pastor Marc Boegner
The Rev. Dr. R. Newton Flew
The Most Rev. Archbishop Germanos
The Rev. Dr. Douglas Horton.
- (iii) That the Rev. Canon L. Hodgson be elected as Theological Secretary and the Rev. Dr. Floyd W. Tomkins as Associate Secretary in America.
- (iv) That the three Theological Commissions be continued as at present constituted.

- (v) That the following be elected members of the Executive Committee:

Professor H. S. Alivisatos, D.D.
The Rev. Dr. M. E. Aubrey, C.H.
Baron C. W. Th. van Boetzelaer van Dubbeldam
Bischof D. Dr. Otto Dibelius
The Rt. Rev. Bishop Angus Dun, D.D.
The Rt. Rev. Bishop Fuglsang-Damgaard, D.D.
The Rev. D. T. Niles
Professor D. Ernst Staehelin
The Rev. Dr. A. R. Wentz.

On the motion of Dr. Floyd Tomkins, the Commission unanimously passed the following Resolutions:—

- (i) (Seconded by Mr. Le Quesne)

RESOLVED that the Commission on Faith and Order extends to Mr. W. Rodman Parvin its warm thanks for his valued services as Treasurer during recent years, and informs him that, in accordance with the arrangements agreed to by this Commission and by the first Assembly of the World Council of Churches held this summer in Amsterdam, the financial responsibility for the work of this Commission will be taken over by the World Council of Churches after December 31st, 1948. It therefore authorises and directs him to transfer all Faith and Order funds which he holds on that date to the Treasurer of the World Council of Churches.

- (ii) (Seconded by the Bishop of Lichfield)

RESOLVED that the Commission on Faith and Order records its grateful appreciation of the services of the Rev. Canon Tissington Tatlow, D.D., as its European Treasurer for more than fifteen years. During this time, not only has he cared for the details of income and expenditure, but it has been largely due to his personal efforts that appropriations from Churches and gifts from individuals have been secured for the support of our work. He has also secured many special gifts that financed the Edinburgh Conference of 1937, and as its Treasurer he cared for its manifold business. Beyond that, he has arranged for the attendance of a youth group at most of our meetings year by year, and in his many years of work for the Student Christian Movement he has had a significant share in initiating the methods that have become the basis of the present œcumenical programme, and in developing those who are now its leaders.

As the financial responsibility for our work passes to the World Council of Churches at the close of this present year, and his office as European Treasurer comes to an end, the Commission takes this opportunity to express its deep appreciation of his many services and to convey to him its cordial thanks.

It was reported that Pastor Lic. H. Renkewitz of the Moravian Church had been appointed by the Central Committee to fill the vacancy on the Commission caused by the death of Bischof D. Paul Th. Jensen.

It was agreed to nominate Dr. Hans Schönfeld for appointment by the Central Committee to fill a vacant place in the representation of the German Evangelical Church.

BUDGET.

It was reported that the following expenditure budget for January 1st—December 31st, 1949, submitted by the Continuation Committee on August 21st, had been approved by the Finance Committee of the World Council:—

World Council's Commission on Faith and Order

Proposed Budget for Annual Expenditure.

Provision in Consolidated Budget (v. Documents p. 74)	\$25,500
	<u>(£6,375)</u>

European Expenses.

General Secretary:—

	£	£	£	\$
Salary	700			
Children's allowances ...	120	820		
Expenses account ...		100		
Clerical assistance (at £6 per wk. incl. insurance)		300		
Postage and printing ...		300		
Supplies and equipment		100		
Travel and expenses in Geneva, etc.		300		
Office—rent, light & heat		230	2,150	
Theological Secretary ...		400		
Clerical assistance ...		150		
Postage and stenciling ...		100		
Supplies and equipment		50		
Travel		50	750	
Committee Meetings			375	
Theological Commissions and other groups			1,500	
Youth Group			100	
			<u>4,875</u>	19,500.00

American Expenses.

	\$	
American Secretary	2,400.00	
Office expenses:—		
Clerical assistance	1,200.00	
Postage and telephone	200.00	
Supplies and equipment	200.00	
Printing and publishing	400.00	
Theological Commission	800.00	
Travel and Meetings	800.00	
	<hr/>	
	6,000.00	6,000.00
		<hr/>
		\$25,500.00
		<hr/>

AMERICAN THEOLOGICAL COMMITTEE.

The following Resolution was agreed to on the motion of Dr. Flew, seconded by Baron Boetzelaer van Dubbeldam:

RESOLVED that this Commission desires to express deep gratitude to the American Theological Committee for their prolonged work in the last nine years under the chairmanship of Dr. George W. Richards, and for the volume *The Nature of the Church*, and also to express the earnest hope that the co-operation of that Committee (whether composed of its present members or reconstituted) with the Commission on the Church will be continued.

COMMISSION ON INTERCOMMUNION.

The Rev. Prof. D. M. Baillie reported that, besides himself as Chairman, there were the following members of the European Section of this Commission:

Prof. H. S. Alivisatos ... Vice-Chairman
Rev. Dr. John Marsh ... Secretary
Rev. Prof. Dr. Ragnar Askmark
Rev. H. R. T. Brandreth, O.G.S.
Prof. T. C. Chao
Bischof D. Dr. Otto Dibelius
Rev. A. G. Hebert, S.S.M.
Rev. J. P. Hickinbotham
Rt. Rev. Bishop Leslie Newbigin
Dr. G. W. Obermann
Rev. E. A. Payne, B.Litt.
Prof. Jean de Saussure
Prof. Edmund Schlink
Prof. L. A. Zander.

He proposed for addition:—

Prof. Henri Clavier

Rev. Dr. Hugh Thomson Kerr

Rev. K. Philipos

Rev. Philip Watson.

This was agreed to.

MEMBERSHIP.

DR. FLEW reported that questions had been raised about the presence on the Edinburgh Continuation Committee of a member of the Czecho-Slovakian Church which did not accept the theological basis of the Faith and Order Movement and the World Council. Canon Hodgson gave an account of the discussion at Hindsgaul, Denmark, in 1935, after which that Church had accepted the invitation to be represented at the Edinburgh Conference, an invitation issued and accepted on that basis. The Edinburgh Conference had appointed Bishop Stejskal as a member of the Continuation Committee, but he had since died and there had been no proposal to replace him.

DR. FLEW also called attention to the small representation of the Church of England on the Commission and PROF. HARTFORD to the absence of any representative of the Episcopal Church of Scotland. THE REV. E. A. PAYNE asked how it would be possible to secure some representation of Churches which had not been members of the Edinburgh Conference, but had since joined the World Council. It was agreed that the Secretary should be instructed to bring these matters before the World Council Central Committee.

FUTURE PLANS.

THE REV. OLIVER S. TOMKINS said that he would like to ask the reaction of members of the Commission to some ideas about new departures made possible by having a full-time Secretary. He instanced:—(i) Co-operation with the World Council Study Department. (ii) Co-operation with the Youth Department. (iii) The drawing in of lay co-operation and the production of literature suitable for this purpose. (iv) Visits to areas where experiments in Christian unity were going forward, so that the Commission and the Council might have full and accurate information.

THE BISHOP OF LICHFIELD emphasised the importance of this last suggestion. DR. FLOYD TOMKINS agreed, but added a caution against giving any impression that the Faith and Order Movement was promoting any particular union.

It was not their business to tell the Churches what they should do, but to help them with information that would enable them to do their own work in their own way. The Secretary would have to walk very carefully.

On the third point, DR. MACDONALD suggested that, when the volumes planned by the Theological Commissions were issued, there might also be some smaller books epitomising their contents in a more popular style.

THE CHAIRMAN reported that the World Council Central Committee had agreed that the next Assembly should be held in 1953 in the United States. The Faith and Order Theological Commissions had reported that they could not have the material ready for a Faith and Order Conference to be held before 1952. This raised the question whether they should have the Faith and Order Conference (which might be smaller than the previous ones at Lausanne and Edinburgh) in 1952, followed by the World Council Assembly in America in 1953, or both Conference and Assembly in the United States in the same year. Considerable discussion followed, but no attempt was made to take any decision.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING.

THE CHAIRMAN reported that the World Council Central Committee would be meeting in England from July 7th-13th, 1949, preceded by a meeting of its executive on July 4th-5th. He said that it would be convenient for the Commission to meet either just before or just after those dates. After considerable discussion a vote was taken which showed a very slight majority in favour of the later date and the following Resolution was agreed to:—

RESOLVED that the next meeting of the Commission be held if possible in connection with the meeting of the World Council Central Committee to be held in England in July, 1949; that the Executive Committee be instructed to fix the precise dates after obtaining further information on whether members would prefer June 30th-July 4th or July 14th-18th; and that the Executive Committee be empowered to act on behalf of the Commission in all matters where action is required before the Commission meets again.

Before conducting the closing devotion, THE CHAIRMAN expressed his thanks to the members of the Commission for their support and the thanks of the meeting to the Secretaries.

CONFERENCE SESSIONS.

I.

The Commission on the Church.

(i) REPORT BY DR. FLEW.

Last year I drew the attention of the Continuation Committee to the most valuable work of the American Theological Committee across the Atlantic, and afterwards, on October 9th, I was able personally to thank the theologians who produced it at their meeting in New York. That meeting proved productive of mutual understanding. For a whole day they gave all their attention to the plans for the proposed biblical volume and the proposed historical volume, and I must acknowledge a deep debt of gratitude to them for the suggestions which they made; practically all of these have been adopted. Throughout the last year I have drawn the attention of theologians to the American volume on *The Nature of the Church* and all my stock of copies is exhausted. I hope that this volume will receive further study as the result of Professor C. T. Craig's presence with us to-day, and that his masterly analysis in the opening paper will be still more widely studied.

This year I would call the attention of the Faith and Order Commission (as our Continuation Committee is now to be called) to a document from the other side of the world. I have been able to fulfil a long-standing promise to visit Australia and there, in Melbourne, I discovered a work which embodies the results of conversations extending over fifteen years—from 1932 to 1947. Its immediate concern is with the Anglican and Methodist Churches alone. But it should be of great value to us all. Like most Anglo-Saxon statements which had their origin in the period prior to the Edinburgh Conference, this document from Victoria gives far more attention to the Ministry and Sacraments. But, unlike other such statements, the document begins with an impressive list of agreements on the nature of the Church. It faces the division of opinion as between the two opposing views of the Ministry without any claim to have reconciled them, or any unreal formula. But the area of agreement is very wide. I have found great encouragement in the fact that such a document should come to us from Australia, so far away, and hope that the discussions in Section I of the Amsterdam programme will lead to further studies, not only

in Victoria but in the other States of Australia. In New Zealand, in the course of the last year, a ten or twelve-day Faith and Order Conference has been held. I have not yet received the printed report, but it will reach me at some time in the near future.

The second theme of this report is that we should be glad that the World Assembly itself has formulated a list of agreements and differences on the subject of the Universal Church in God's design. In itself this has been a most remarkable step forward. Particularly we should welcome the collaboration of Professor Karl Barth and Professor Michael Ramsey in the employment of the dialectical method of tracing disagreements within an agreement. I have noted that not all the alleged disagreements separate us as communions from one another. Many of them cut right across our confessional boundaries. But it is all to the good if we can pierce through certain disagreements to the motives or causes which may lie beneath them. Frequent fears have been expressed whether the Study Department has not been trespassing on Faith and Order ground. I have consistently welcomed such trespassing. It was the Life and Work Movement and not Faith and Order which produced that book on the nature of the Church by Dr. Visser 't Hooft and Dr. J. H. Oldham which had a great influence on the minds of the delegates to Oxford and Edinburgh. It is all to the good that the Study Department has continued the process of œcumenical education on the study of the Church in God's design which this particular Commission had begun.

The statements from the Churches for Volume III are coming in steadily. The Presbyterian and the Baptist have been published in the last year. The Disciples or Churches of Christ have sent in their document. Archbishop Rinkel has promised a statement from the Old Catholics. The Lutheran statement from the Church of Sweden is being supplemented by Professor Skydsgaard for Denmark and I hope, too, from Norway, so that there may be one document from Scandinavia. We already have in hand the statements from the Methodists, the Anglicans (two), the Society of Friends, in addition to the eleven statements from the United States of America contained in the American Report. I think that the plans for this volume are so far advanced that, subject to two conditions, I could propose a meeting of some days' duration to discuss them and prepare a tentative report on them in 1949. This report would look forward to Volume IV and our final report. But we could not issue it until we had in hand all the articles for the biblical and historical volumes. But the two conditions are serious. We

have as yet, I fear, no statement from the Orthodox Churches and no report from the English Congregationalists. I believe that only a week or so back the British group encouraged Dr. John Marsh to gather together some younger Congregational scholars to produce such a statement. But time presses and I hear that Dr. Micklem has already produced a document which might be the ground work for the project. Dr. John Whale has some valuable pages in *The Ministry and Sacraments*, produced for Edinburgh in 1937.

But these two conditions are quite essential: an Orthodox statement with all its characteristic stresses, its enrichment in the course of "holy tradition", and also with what some of us would call its uncompromising austerity; and the statement of the traditional Congregationalist view, now, I believe, held by Professor Karl Barth.

Ten years have passed since this Commission was decided upon and established at Clarens in 1938. Six of those years have been for most European theologians years of war and therefore of increased administration and narrowed leisure. All the work has had to be carried on in moments which could be gleaned from a busy life. It is therefore all the more a cause of thankfulness to find, especially in the last eighteen months, that over the world other hands have been active in the great emprise. More and more I feel the strength and truth of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit who makes His home in the Church and can make my own those grave and lovely words of Francis Paget: "I thank my God that in a time of incalculable changes, when all around is shifting and uncertain, there is one cause which will never betray whatever faith and love a man may give to it: that whatever else on earth breaks up and disappears there is one body which dieth no more", and that is the Body of Christ.

CANON ARCHDALL referred to a passage on page 412 of the recently published *Life of Archbishop Temple* in which it was recorded that he "wrote to the Cardinal Secretary of State at the Vatican to inform the Holy See that the World Council was being established, expressing the hope that it might be possible 'to exchange information with agencies of the Church of Rome on matters of common interest' and that the Council 'should have the help from time to time of unofficial consultation with Roman Catholic theologians and scholars'. Several months passed before an answer was received through the Apostolic delegate in London, to the effect that His Eminence saw no obstacles in the way of carrying out Temple's proposals." He asked whether this had been followed up and whether anything was going on as a result. DR. FLEW replied that he had maintained con-

tact with Fr. Bévenot throughout all the last ten years and he hoped to find ways of arranging for articles giving the Roman Catholic point of view. DR. SCHÖNFELD said that since the Vatican prohibition of Roman Catholic attendances at the Amsterdam Assembly the Holy Office had authorised the continuance of the work of a joint study group under the Archbishop of Paderborn and Bishop Stählin. A carefully prepared conference of *Una Sancta* was also permitted.

THE REV. KENNETH RICHES reported on recent additions to the statements received from Churches. CANON HODGSON asked about the date by which the Commission could be ready to issue its report. THE CHAIRMAN said that the World Council Central Committee had decided that the next Assembly should be held in the United States in 1953; it might be inconvenient to have a Faith and Order Conference in 1952, 1951 would be preferable. Could this be managed? DR. FLEW hoped it would not be necessary to have a Conference prepared for hurriedly in 1951. He believed that Dr. Baillie would have equal difficulty for the Commission on Intercommunion. At Edinburgh in 1937 the section on Grace had been able to make headway better than that on the Ministry and Sacraments because its preparatory volume had been published in so much better time. Their volumes on the Church ought to be published at least a year before the Conference and he could see no chance of their being ready by 1950. DR. BAILLIE supported this. The European section of the Commission on Intercommunion had only been appointed one-and-a-half years ago and was now just getting into its stride. Their volume ought to be in the hands of delegates a year before the Conference and, at the present rate of publishing, he did not see how it could be ready before 1951.

- (ii) REPORT BY PROFESSOR C. T. CRAIG on the work done by the American Theological Committee since autumn, 1939.

There has never been a more continuous œcumenical conversation in the history of the Movement. We have had a membership of from twenty to twenty-two, meeting once or sometimes twice in the year for the last ten years; the meetings have usually lasted from two to three days. Papers have been prepared by individual members in as short a form as possible, setting forth a series of theses which have then been discussed, and the primary value has lain in the discussion. We have come to see our brethren and their beliefs in quite a new way.

The make-up of the Committee varied somewhat from our gathering here: we had four different types of Presbyterians, otherwise no more than three of any one Church, very seldom as many as three Anglicans. There was, therefore, a different emphasis from a meeting like the present one.

At the beginning, we received statements such as Dr. Flew has been telling us about:—

(i) The relationship of the doctrine of the Church to our conception of God and Christ and our relationship to God in the world. This was underscored by the work of Section I of the World Council Assembly last week. The consideration of the doctrine of the Church must always be in this larger context of belief.

(ii) The sociological structure out of which the various doctrines of the Church have emerged. It is impossible to deny that no doctrine ever has developed except in some very special relationship to some social situation. If we consider doctrine apart from such a factor, our consideration will not be a real one.

(iii) The fructifying character of dissent within the Church—dissent not *from*, but *within* the Church, rather than the sin of schism. Unity must always be unity in variety. There has been fructification in the past and this will not cease with the coming to maturity of the present œcumenical movement.

(iv) Authority within the Church. On what authority is a particular doctrine of the Church held? How do we believe that this or that is the will of God? What is the authority of Scripture for the Church? What is the seat of authority within the Church? And so on.

The only ground of authority is God. It is not necessary to add a second in the form of Christ—we do not believe in two Gods, but one. But how is the authority of God mediated to us and what do we mean by authority? It includes authority in rule and authority in teaching. Americans preferred the term “channels of influence”.

There are three channels:—Scripture, Church and the witness of the Holy Spirit. There was complete agreement about these three—no Christian can ever ignore any of them; the differences lay in the emphasis placed on first, second or third. There were no fundamentalists on the Committee and so no one who held that Scripture was really the sole basis for the doctrine of the Church. There was a suggestion

of *suprema Scriptura* to replace *sola Scriptura*. The latter was the slogan of the Reformation, but in practice no one can carry it out without the second and third channels. Some would rest upon Scripture at one point, others at another. The procedure appeared highly selective. The sentence about this on page 15 of *The Nature of the Church* came from the report of the Church of the Brethren, but was passed by every other confession.

The Committee was thus divided into those who held by :

- (a) The Biblicist point of view;
- (b) The Word (e.g. Lutherans);
- (c) The Tradition of the Church (e.g. Anglicans).

Among those who held by (c) it was maintained that the Church wrote the Bible—a point not shared by other members of the Committee, yet understood. The position of the Methodists was that as God is a living God it is no use to look for the norm within history. The position of the Southern Presbyterians was between that of the Biblicists and Lutherans: they attempt to lay more stress upon the words of the Bible than the Lutheran position would necessarily call for.

In conclusion, it appears that these various positions divide into two groups:—

(i) Those for whom there is a fixed form of the Church that cannot be departed from without departing from the will of God (Anglo-Catholic, Baptist).

(ii) Those who hold that all forms which the Church has held have only functional significance. Breaks in the life of the Church are undesirable, but history has moulded the forms of the Church in the past and new demands of new situations should not be thwarted because of past days.

How is there to be a bridge between these two positions? This, so far, has seemed an insoluble problem. We have gone as far as we can in the present discussions. After Amsterdam, whatever is done will be by reconstitution, following this meeting of the World Council's Commission on Faith and Order to-day. The American Committee is already dissolved.

DR. GARRISON and PROF. W. M. HORTON wished to confirm the accuracy and fairness of Dr. Craig's account of the American Committee's work. DR. SCHÖNFELD said that continental theologians, who had been isolated for some

years, would like to discuss the American Committee's Report. Could it be published in some other languages besides English?

PROF. DE SAUSSURE thought that progress might come by making a clear distinction between revelation and inspiration. Revelation was the work of the *Logos*, given through the Word contained in the Bible; inspiration was the work of the Holy Spirit, giving the *testimonium internum*. They should not confuse the rôles of the second and third Persons of the Trinity, for the internal testimony of the Spirit was not given as a second source of revelation, but to vivify the revelation of the Word.

(iii) PROPOSED REPORT OF THE COMMISSION.

Volume I: The Biblical Basis

1. The Conception of the People of God in the Old Testament.
2. Survey of the word "Ecclesia".
3. The Church as the New Israel.
4. The Church and the Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus.
5. The Primitive Church.
6. The Position of the Twelve and the Interpretation of the Promise to Peter.
7. The Church in (a) the Pauline writings.
(b) I Peter.
(c) the Johannine writings.
8. The Church Triumphant.

Volume II: The Doctrine of the Church from the second century to the twentieth

1. The Church in the West, during the first four centuries.
2. St. Augustine.
3. The Western Church in the Middle Ages.
4. The Eastern Church (a) The Greek Fathers to the eleventh century.
(b) The Orthodox Eastern Church since the eleventh century.
5. The Roman Church, from the Council of Trent.
6. Luther and his followers.
7. Calvin and his followers.

8. Anglicanism in the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.
9. The Independents.
10. Anglicanism in the nineteenth century.
11. Lutheranism in the nineteenth century.
12. The Modern Calvinist Doctrine.

Volume III : Statements of the present beliefs as to the Church held by the various Communion to-day

1. Roman Catholic.
2. Orthodox Eastern Churches.
3. Anglican.
4. Lutheran: (a) Germany.
(b) Scandinavia.
5. Reformed.
6. Baptist.
7. Congregationalist.
8. The Society of Friends.
9. Methodist.
10. The Disciples, or Churches of Christ.
11. The Old Catholic.
12. Younger Churches, in the East: (a) India.
(b) China.

Volume IV : Constructive Statements aiming at a synthesis of the varying views, and at a doctrine of the Church which might be accepted by all.

THE CHAIRMAN having asked for more information about the contents of the proposed volumes to be issued by the Commission as a whole, THE REV. KENNETH RICHES distributed typed copies of the above prospectus and DR. FLEW replied to a question from DR. MACDONALD about the treatment of the doctrines of the Pietists in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. PROF. FLOROVSKY expressed doubts about the proposed arrangement in Volume II. It would be a mistake to make the suggested division between West and East; in the early centuries there was no separation, but one undivided Church. To treat it otherwise would give the impression that the Greek Fathers, together with St. Augustine, were not Fathers of the whole Church. It was misleading to put Hilary on one side and Athanasius on the other. It was a very common habit to make the proposed

division, but it was wrong and it was time to make a fresh start. He also thought that it would be very important to have a study of Roman Catholic development since the Council of Trent. The difference between "Catholic" and "Protestant" teaching was really rooted in Christological doctrine: what *is* Christ between His first and second coming into the world? Orthodox doctrine could only be intelligibly presented on the basis of facing that question. DR. FLEW said that it was planned to have three papers on the patristic period and the scholars writing them must be trusted to bring out the true relation between East and West. The distribution of papers among subjects was made for convenience and did not imply any assertion of division in fact between East and West. So, too, they must trust their authors to recognise the importance of Christology. The first duty of an editor was to trust his contributors until they revealed deficiencies. MR. RICHES added that the titles in the typescript did not necessarily denote chapter headings; there might be rearrangements. The Christological issue as between "Catholic" and "Protestant" would have to find its place in Volume IV, where the attempt at synthesis would have to deal with such theological points. DR. MACDONALD suggested an editorial committee which should instruct the various contributors to keep their eyes open to recognise points of synthesis or unity occurring in different sources.

PROF. ALIVISATOS said he agreed with Dr. Florovsky about the undivided Church of East and West in the early centuries. Yet the ways of thought of the Greek and Latin Fathers were different and, in order to give a clear picture, it was necessary to recognise this fact. PROF. FLOROVSKY said it was necessary to avoid the danger of provincialising Orthodoxy as due to the Greek mind and Catholicism as due to the Latin. PROF. W. M. HORTON thought it would be better to reverse the proposed order, to take the East and the Greek Fathers first and then the West and the Latin Fathers. THE CHAIRMAN suggested that it might be a good thing to circulate the papers to a circle somewhat wider than the Commission itself. MR. LE QUESNE asked how many contributors had already agreed to write and by what dates they had promised to send in their papers. DR. FLEW replied that it was very difficult to get firm promises and he had not very many as yet, but he was still trying. The Commission itself would perform the function of the editorial committee suggested by Dr. Macdonald. He assured Prof. Florovsky that his point about the unity of patristic thought would be stressed and was grateful to Prof. Alivisatos for his support on the differences between Eastern and Western

ways of thinking. Prof. Horton's point had not hitherto occurred to them in any of their discussions; it now struck him as most reasonable and would have to be given serious consideration. Did Dr. Craig mean to imply that the American Theological Committee had completed its work and was dissolved? He hoped this was not the case; if Dr. Richards felt that he could not go on any longer, might there not be a new Chairman? Would Dr. Craig himself be willing to fill that post?

This raised the question of the precise relation between the Theological Commission of which Dr. Flew was Chairman and the American Theological Committee. CANON HODGSON read Resolution 13 of the 1938 meeting of the Edinburgh Continuation Committee, as follows:—

“That the American Section of the Continuation Committee be asked to appoint a Theological Committee to co-operate with the aforesaid Commission under whatever plan may approve itself to both groups after full consultation”.

It was clearly the wish of the meeting that the American Theological Committee should be continued to co-operate in the work of the Theological Commission and THE CHAIRMAN suggested that this should receive the attention of the Executive Committee.

II.

The Commission on Ways of Worship.

(i) REPORT BY MR. W. VOS.

I felt a little embarrassed when I was requested to read a report to this Commission instead of our Chairman, Professor Van der Leeuw, whose brilliant account at the Committee's last meeting in Clarens will be gratefully remembered by all who were present. When, however, I was informed that only a factual report on progress was required, I gladly undertook it.

As to the *Membership*: it proved to be difficult to find an adequate representation of the Church of England. Up to now no member of the Anglican Communion has attended a meeting of our Commission nor taken part in its discussions⁽¹⁾. I have, however, just succeeded in securing the collaboration of the Rev. A. H. Couratin, Principal of St. Stephen's House, Oxford, and the Rev. G. Fitzgerald, Paignton, so that the Commission now consists of 1 Old Catholic, 1 Methodist, 1 Baptist, 4 Anglican, 5 Orthodox,

(1) Apart from the Rev. Dr. L. Hodgson, who as Faith and Order Secretary attended the Cambridge meeting in April, 1948.

6 Lutheran and 9 Reformed members—27 in all—divided over seventeen countries of the world. From the list, which is herewith presented to you, it will be noticed that the Younger Churches are still in the same position as the Church of England originally was and I shall be pleased with any advice which may lead to the filling of the vacancies still remaining. It will be generally agreed, I think, that at the Commission's next meeting in July, 1949, at least *two* representatives of the Younger Churches should be present.

The *lines of enquiry*, drawn up by Professor Hodgson and the Chairman before the Commission could meet, were revised in January, 1947. In the terms of reference it is stated that the study is to be undertaken "with a view to promoting growth in mutual understanding among the Churches". We are not simply laying plans for a theological study of the history and doctrinal implications of Christian worship, but working with one definite end in view.

Because of this, and of the other terms of reference, five separate lines of enquiry need to be initiated simultaneously, and a sixth later on. In each of the first five, papers are to be invited from those competent to supply them on the several topics involved. These papers will then be studied by the Commission itself, and the Commission will (i) decide what selection of the material received is to be published and in what form, (ii) itself pursue the sixth line of enquiry (see F. below), and (iii) prepare its report and present it to the Continuation Committee.

A. A series of papers describing and interpreting the actual worship of the different Churches as carried on at present. Each might fall into two parts: first, a description of typical Services as they might appear to a journalist sent by his editor to visit a church and describe what he saw and heard, and secondly, an explanation of the significance for the Christian believer of what was seen and heard, showing why it took the form it did.

(Out of these papers might come the leaflets suggested in clause (e) of the terms of reference.)

B. A series of papers answering the following questions:—

(1) How far are the following expressive of means and ends of worship:—

- (A) The Word of God: a) reading of the Bible
b) sermon
c) instruction
d) liturgical forms

- (B) Sacramental worship: a) Eucharist
b) Baptism
c) Other Sacraments

(C) The relations between (A) and (B).

(D) How far ought worship to provide for:—

- a) Thanksgiving
- b) Penitence and Absolution
- c) Adoration
- d) Petition and Intercession for living and dead
- e) Oblation or Offering

(E) How far ought worship to provide for free prayers as well as set forms?

(F) What is held to be the relation of the worship of the local worshipping company, the Church Universal and the Church in Heaven?

(2) Are there any other elements of worship that must be considered?

(3) How are all the above provided for in the worship as customarily conducted in the writer's Church?

(4) Are these elements of equal importance or should some be given greater emphasis than others?

(5) Is there any right order in which these elements should follow one another in a Service?

Items (2) and (4) may be omitted.

C. In some Churches there are strongly marked tendencies or movements towards reconsideration and revision of traditional modes of worship; and papers are needed describing these movements, giving

- (1) the direction they take;
- (2) their causes and grounds;
- (3) the reactions they produce;
- (4) their doctrinal implications.

D. A series of papers contributed by those responsible for experiments in "liturgical creation" (see clause (c) in terms of reference) in (1) œcumenical and other special gatherings, and (2) the "Younger Churches".

Each paper should state what was aimed at, and the means adopted in the given circumstances for achieving the end.

E. A scholarly historical study of Christian worship in the New Testament and afterwards, with a view to discovering the relative place of (a) the office, (b) the sacraments, (c) preaching, (d) non-liturgical worship, and to answering the following questions:—

- (1) When and why did the tendency arise to emphasise any one of these elements as more important than the others?
- (2) Did different customs in this respect arise on the basis of differences in doctrine?

F. An attempt to answer the question: Are the existing differences in ways of worship (a) based on differences in doctrine so that they could only co-exist in one Church after these doctrinal differences had been reconciled, or (b) attempts to do what is essentially the same thing in different ways in order to meet different psychological or cultural circumstances?

It was the Rev. Oliver Tomkins who, at the 1938 meeting of the Continuation Committee, proposed that the Commission on Ways of Worship should produce leaflets describing and interpreting different traditions of worship. In consequence of this, *Section A* was included in our Lines of Enquiry and papers have been written by the following contributors:

Orthodox:	Dr. N. Zernov (London)
Old Catholic:	Rt. Rev. Dr. A. Kury (Bern)
Anglican:	None
Lutheran (German):	Rev. Dr. H. H. Kramm (Oxford)
(Swedish):	Rt. Rev. Dr. Y. T. Brilioth (Växjö)
(American):	Rev. Prof. Dr. L. D. Reed (Philadelphia)
(Alsace):	Rev. Prof. Dr. R. Will (Strasbourg)
Reformed:	Rev. Prof. Dr. Jean de Saussure (Lausanne)
Congregational:	Rev. Dr. N. Micklem (Oxford)
Methodist:	Rev. W. J. Blight (New Zealand)
Society of Friends:	Percy Bartlett and Robert Davis (Friends' House, London)
Churches of Christ:	Principal A. L. Haddon (New Zealand)

Most of these papers are excellent, but not all answer the purpose set in clause (e) of the terms of reference; moreover, of the eleven at least six have been published already at the authors' own initiative in magazines or otherwise. Which papers are to be considered for printing as one of the Commission's contributions to the next World Conference on Faith and Order, and in what form this will have to be done remains, therefore, still an open question.

In America, some pioneering work was done by a group of women in Rochester, N.Y. The Report of their studies has been published by the American office of Faith and Order and with gratitude received by our Commission: Report of a study group on Ways of Worship and "Suggestions for Inter-Church Study Groups on Ways of Worship".

At the meeting of the Commission in April of this year I drew the attention of the members to a passage in the Report of the 1939 meeting of the Continuation Committee at which Dr. Hodgson suggested whether the Commission on Ways of Worship would not be the natural body to take cognizance of the paragraph from ch. IV of the Edinburgh Report in which was stated that no agreement was reached

“on the way in which we should understand the words ‘all generations shall call me blessed’ ”. Fr. Boulgakoff, who was not present at that meeting, supported this proposal by letter in the following words:

“I feel deeply satisfied by the proposal of our Secretary to include in the programme of the future ‘Commission on Ways of Worship’ the paragraph from Chapter IV. of the Edinburgh Report on the devotion of the Mother of God. I am heartily supporting this proposal which will be certainly received with great satisfaction in the Orthodox world (and, I suppose, in the Roman Catholic, too). The further movement of this discussion in the œcumenical theology is necessary.

“I agree that this discussion may be included in the series of ‘leaflets describing different traditions of worship’. It would be desirable there to express the different mariological doctrines of different Christian confessions. If we pass over this question once more in silence, it will make an unfavourable impression of a certain evasiveness on an important question. I personally should like to participate very willingly in such a leaflet.

“I think that the discussion might be concentrated on the following questions:—

1. The meaning of the Mother of God for the Incarnation.
2. The sanctification and glorification of the Mother of God in connection with it.
3. The place of the Mother of God in the Church and in the whole of mankind.
4. The meaning of the devotion of the Mother of God for the reunion of Christianity and for the whole œcumenical movement.”

After ample discussion, our Commission agreed that this should primarily be considered a liturgical subject and that two papers should be prepared by the Orthodox brethren which would have to be circulated to the other members for their comments before the Commission’s next meeting.

Valuable material has been received on *Section B*, to which great importance should be attached. Papers were contributed by the following authors:

Roman Catholic:	Rev. Dr. F. van der Meer (Holland)
Anglican:	Fr. A. G. Hebert (England) Rt. Rev. John Daughlish (Bishop of Nassau)
Reformed (Scotland):	Rev. Dr. W. D. Maxwell (Glas- gow)
(Switzerland):	Rev. Prof. Dr. J. Schweizer (Basel)
(U.S.A.):	Rev. Dr. Scott Brenner (Reading, Pa.)
Churches of Christ:	Rev. A. W. Stephenson (Australia)

Eight or ten memoranda⁽¹⁾ belong to this section. All members of the Commission were asked to supply a statement on (a) Word and Sacrament; (b) Sacrament and Symbol; (c) Sacrifice and Priesthood, for further elucidation of these difficult subjects. In these statements the views of the Churches they represented would have to be described and explained at length; if the traditional positions were being left, the new development in thinking and liturgical practice should also be mentioned.

It is to be regretted that as yet neither the Orthodox nor Lutheran contributions on Section B, nor the Orthodox memorandum have been received. I should be grateful for the name of a Lutheran theologian to contribute a paper in place of Bishop Brilioth who felt compelled to refuse. And if members of the World Council's Commission on Faith and Order think that this section should be supplemented by more papers from other denominations, I should be glad to hear it.

A few remarks I would still like to make. I wonder whether it would be desirable to circulate the papers which are intended to be published to some other representatives of the respective communions for their criticisms and corrections, so that they may carry the greatest possible authority. A paper by the Younger Churches, which have their own distinctive contribution to make, might be added, too, apart from the material on *Section D*.

Fr. Hebert, the Anglican contributor, who disagreed with the order of our questionnaire, prefixed in his paper something on the tradition of worship, which to his mind was the necessary starting-point. Two reactions from members—one who was in sympathy with Fr. Hebert's stressing of the given-ness of liturgical forms, the other arguing that before judging liturgies one must have and develop principles and that this is not done by invoking tradition—led to a most satisfactory discussion on which a paragraph will presumably be included in the Commission's Report.

Section C deals with the Liturgical Movement in its various forms. Papers were received from:

(1) Viz.: Rev. Dr. P. Katz and Prof. Dr. J. Schweizer, Rev. A. Graf, Rev. R. Paquier, Rt. Rev. F. C. N. Hicks, *The Eucharistic Sacrifice*, Prof. Dr. R. Will, Prof. Dr. G. van der Leeuw, Prof. Dr. A. E. Rüthy, Rt. Rev. Dr. W. Stählin.

Also possibly Rev. A. Graf, *Formen des Gottesdienstes insbesondere der Anbetung in den reformierten Kirchen der alemannischen Schweiz. Formen des Gottesdienstes in den Holländischen Kirchen.*

Rev. Prof. Dr. J. B. Benoit (Reformed, France)
Rev. H. de Candole (Anglican, England)
Rev. Dr. H. Asmussen (Lutheran, Germany)
Rev. Prof. Dr. R. Will (General Survey).

I am aware that this number is disproportionate to the importance of this Movement, but I expect that Denzil Patrick's manuscript on Liturgical Renewal, which is now being completed and brought up to date, will appear as a volume in the series *Ecclesia Militans*, edited by the World Council's Study Department, just in time to serve as material for the next World Conference on Faith and Order. If there were no Liturgical Movement, the Commission's task would be much easier, but less hopeful. Now the liturgical situation of many Churches is far from clear; they are *en route* and we do not yet know what will become of their liturgical life. Personally, I believe that this Movement may be considered as a special aspect of the Œcumenical Movement, akin to both Faith and Order and Life and Work—not drawing the Churches together in common action or common discussion, but working from within at the renewal of the liturgical life of each Church separately. As such, it seems to me of the utmost importance, since it touches the very heart of the Church, in which the problems of Faith and Order and Life and Work are concentrated. Let me tell you that these considerations have recently been laid down and worked out in a plan for the formation of an œcumenical centre for liturgical research, into which the work of the Commission on Ways of Worship, which has only limited terms of reference and will have finished its task before long, could gradually grow. The plan was drafted by six members of our Commission, representing the main traditions of the Church, and will shortly be submitted to those who are expected to be interested in it.

I must confess that *Section D* has not yet received sufficient attention. At the request of Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft, clause (c) was included in the terms of reference, the intention of which was that our Commission should give certain principles of liturgical creation, as a great many people who work on this question were needing some guidance. I can only promise that I shall remind the Commission of this clause and hope that, apart from the one received (by the Fellowship of Unity, Egypt), some more papers will be collected.

Lately some doubt has arisen among the Officers of the Commission whether the fifth line of enquiry (*Section E*)

is really necessary to be pursued⁽¹⁾. Time has not yet come for a complete history of Christian worship; and why should we ask people to write on details which have been treated already in still available books? I would mention two books which could serve our purpose; for the New Testament evidence: Oscar Cullmann, *Le culte dans l'Eglise primitive* (Neuchâtel-Paris), and for the further development: William D. Maxwell, *An Outline of Christian Worship, its development and forms* (Oxford University Press). If necessary, these books could be circulated to some other scholars, asking them for their criticism, but I do not think it useful to invite other contributors to write fresh papers on the same subjects.

I hope the Commission will be able to hold its report-drafting sessions not later than the summer of 1950 and that the report and papers will be published as soon as possible afterwards. The Chairman has promised to draw up a provisional report on the main points of agreement and disagreement as revealed in the papers thus far presented and the discussions thus far held. This will have to be ready before the Commission's next meeting, as it may be that the World Council's Commission on Faith and Order will want to discuss it at the next opportunity.

Finally, a personal remark. I think I ought to resign the secretaryship, now that Professor van der Leeuw has returned from the Ministry of Education to his professorship in Groningen and Professor Kooiman will have got acquainted with his new function at the University of Amsterdam. Although I have done this work with much pleasure and satisfaction, I feel that my age and experience are not in accordance with such a responsible post. And as the main bulk of the correspondence has been done, I dare to ask Professor Kooiman to take over the secretaryship to which he originally—and I never—was appointed. If, however, at this stage of the preparations, complete withdrawal would be considered as desertion, I shall be glad to be of any further service as a less prominent member.

DR. FLEW asked how *Section E* was developing. MR. VOS replied that the Commission's officers doubted whether that section would really be necessary and agreed with the Chairman that the points in *E* were largely covered in papers under other heads. He also agreed with Dr. Macdonald that

(1) I am afraid one paper has been written already: Principal W. Robinson, *Christian Worship in the New Testament and Afterwards*, with special reference to the relationship of office to the liturgy.

the bibliography would need to be considerably enlarged and with the Chairman's suggestion that the proposed *Section E* might be covered by a short sketch referring to existing books.

DR. SCHÖNFELD asked whether there would be any contribution from Roman Catholic sources with reference to the doctrinal implications of developments in the Benedictine Order. Was not the Liturgical Movement in the Roman Catholic Church leading to developments in the doctrine of the Church in younger circles? It was certainly so in Germany and it would be valuable to have papers on this under *Section C*. MR. VOS agreed that material on the Liturgical Movement in the Roman Catholic Church should be included. There was a chapter in Denzil Patrick's forthcoming book, but it was incomplete and he was thinking of approaching Père Rousseau of Chevetogne. He knew, also, of other monks in Belgium who might be willing to write about it. DR. SCHÖNFELD added that a paper in *Section C* by some first-rate Roman Catholic scholar would be very valuable. He suggested Fr. Winzen who was then in New York.

PROFESSOR ALIVISATOS asked whether there was any place in the scheme for a paper developing the very basic subject of the theological grounds of worship. In the Orthodox Church the worship reflected the basic theology of the Eastern Fathers with two specific things, the mystical element and the emphasis on the Resurrection. Such a paper would reflect the whole system on which the Church was founded. MR. VOS said that these points were dealt with in Dr. Zernov's paper and they were also asking for an Orthodox paper in *Section B* by Fr. Kovalevsky. PASTOR MAURY asked whether there would be any study of the relation between the liturgical practice of a Church and the common faith of its members. People often forgot their catechism, but their faith was influenced by the hymns, etc., which they joined in Sunday by Sunday and by the Services at marriages and funerals. MR. VOS said that there would certainly be something on the first point and the occasional Services would be described and interpreted in some of the papers. PASTOR MAURY thought it might be well to give them a very important place; for some people they were the only Services they attended, their only chance of hearing the Gospel.

PROFESSOR BOENDERMAKER thought that, if there were to be a historical study of Christian worship in the New Testament and after, there would have to be, not one, but at least six papers, for every churchman had his own view of it and no single objective statement was possible. DR.

MACDONALD said that Prof. Alivisatos had drawn attention to a most important element in Orthodox worship, its note of victory due to the emphasis on the Resurrection. This contrasted with the Western Roman rite which never got beyond the Crucifixion, but had its parallel in the Anglican rite which led up to the *Gloria in Excelsis* at the end. PROFESSOR ALIVISATOS added that for the Orthodox every Sunday was a festival of the Resurrection. He would like to see some Orthodox theologian expound what that meant for their worship. This was very essential, both from the doctrinal point of view and also because of the common misunderstanding which thought of Orthodox worship as a dead kind of worship; special attention should be paid to the note of the victory of the living Lord. MR. RICHES thought that Prof. Alivisatos' remarks raised the deeper question whether the whole study should not aim at expressing the theological basis, significance and meaning of different traditions of worship. PROFESSOR ZANDER said that in Orthodox worship they felt the heart of their Church; those who did not feel the meaning of their worship could never have understanding of Orthodoxy. He was surprised that the proposed list of contributors included none of their recognised experts on liturgies. Fr. Kovalevsky had created in Paris what he called a Western Orthodox rite which was simply part of the Roman Mass with certain Orthodox elements added. What would he write about? Would it be the rite he celebrated or the one he did not? He would suggest the Very Rev. Prof. Cyprian Kern, Prof. Boris Sove and Prof. Th. Spassky. MAR THEODOSIUS said that in all Orthodox churches, including that of Malabar, the Eucharist was the central act of worship. It was both a commemoration of the whole incarnate life of Christ and a representation of the heavenly intercession of our Lord and the opportunity for us to join in it. He wished to support what had been said by Professors Alivisatos and Zander.

PROFESSOR CLAVIER asked whether there would be a place for study of oecumenical liturgies such as were used in Egypt at Services of the Fellowship of Unity and for united Services in cases of emergency. He remembered, for example, how Protestants and Roman Catholics had conducted united burial Services in the Dunkirk campaign of 1940. MR. LE QUESNE said that for some of them the most telling part of their worship was the use of hymns, but that subject occurred nowhere in the programme. MR. VOS replied that it was covered by *Section B*. THE CHAIRMAN added that, whilst this was very important, they must beware of their subject becoming too wide. They should certainly

consider the place of singing in worship, but hymnology was a vast study of its own. DR. FLOYD TOMKINS pointed out that there was an ambiguity in the use of the word "liturgical": some people used it to mean set forms as distinct from free prayer, whilst for others it meant sacramental, as distinct from non-sacramental. PROFESSOR W. M. HORTON asked whether the position of the Christian year would have a place in the study? In the United States, a striking feature in recent years had been its recovery in Churches which traditionally had paid no attention to it. Other striking features were prayer and testimony meetings, mid-week worship and the silent worship of the Quakers.

THE CHAIRMAN asked (i) how far the papers were being circulated outside the members of the Commission itself; and (ii) what, if anything, was being done about Fr. Hebert's suggestions. MR. VOS replied (i) that so far the papers had not been circulated more widely, but suggestions on those lines were being considered; (ii) that a whole session of a Commission meeting had been occupied with discussing Fr. Hebert's suggestions and Prof. van der Leeuw was writing a paragraph on it in his report which would come up at the next meeting. Fr. Hebert had seen no mention of tradition and considered that this should be the starting-point of the whole enquiry. Most of the Commission had agreed with him, but one member had said that one must have principles before worship and that these did not come from tradition. THE CHAIRMAN said he felt strongly that liturgy grew by certain inherent laws. It was given. He felt lost at the thought of building it up from principles. He agreed with Pastor Maury that one must have both doctrine and liturgy and that one got the clearest idea of the character of a Church by listening to its forms of worship.

He also wanted to ask for some more information about the proposed liturgical centre. MR. VOS said that the plan had been drafted by six members of the Commission. He had merely wanted to mention it here, as they were not yet far enough on for discussion of details. He himself was convinced that the Liturgical Movement which was developing in so many Churches should be considered a special element in the Œcumenical Movement, parallel to the Faith and Order search for unity by discussion and the Life and Work search for unity by common action. The Liturgical Movement, working from within at the renewal of each Church separately, touched the very heart of the Churches where problems of Faith and Order and Life and Work were concentrated. The plans now being worked out by a small committee would later be sent to all those whom they knew

to be interested and to be taking part in Liturgical Movements in different Churches. THE CHAIRMAN said that at the moment he could see no available means for setting up such an institution. Could it possibly be attached to some school of theology or community centre? It was certainly a very interesting proposal and an important idea to be kept in mind.

PROFESSOR KOOIMAN said that Mr. Vos was the very heart of the work of their Commission and that he did not see how he and Prof. van der Leeuw could carry it on without him. THE CHAIRMAN assured Mr. Vos that it was the wish of the whole Commission that he should continue the work he had so well begun.

(ii) TWO PAPERS BY BISCHOF D. WILHELM STÄHLIN
OF OLDENBURG.

(These papers were read in German by Prof. W. J. Kooiman and a summarised translation in English was given by Dr. John Marsh.)

(i) *Liturgie als Entscheidung.*⁽¹⁾

1. Wir gebrauchen das Wort "Entscheidung" in einem doppelten Sinn: Wir "treffen" Entscheidungen, in unserem persönlichem und in unserem amtlichen Bereich, und je grösser die Tragweite solcher Entscheidungen ist, desto grösser auch unsere Verantwortung; und es "fallen" Entscheidungen, ohne dass wir bewusst eine Entscheidung getroffen hätten. Die Begegnung mit einem Menschen, ein Buch, das uns zufällig in die Hand gerät, ein scheinbar ganz von aussen kommendes, "zufälliges" Ereignis kann über unser ganzes Leben entscheiden. Vielleicht erst lang nachher kommt uns zum Bewusstsein, dass hier eine Entscheidung gefallen ist, ohne dass wir "in die Entscheidung" gestellt worden wären und eine Entscheidung "getroffen" hätten. In beiden Bedeutungen widerspricht der Begriff der Entscheidung der landläufigen *Auffassung der Liturgie*. Während in der Predigt durch den Anruf des göttlichen Wortes der Weg des Lebens und der Weg des Todes vor unsere Seele gestellt und wir also zur Entscheidung aufgerufen werden, können wir, nach dieser verbreiteten Meinung, der Liturgie gegenüber in der Haltung eines unverbindlichen Genusses verharren; kein Zweifel, dass manche eben des-

(1) Nach einem in Jena (28.5.43) und in Stuttgart (30.1.44) gehaltenen Vortrag. Die Knappheit des in der Zeitschrift zur Verfügung stehenden Raumes zwingt mich, mich auf eine Skizze des Gedankengangs zu beschränken.

wegen das "Kirchenkonzert" der Predigt vorziehen. Noch empfindlicher aber scheint der echte Entscheidungscharakter der Liturgie in ihrem Verhältnis zu dem gelebten Leben zu mangeln. Während hier "mit blutigem Ernst" um Entscheidungen gerungen wird, von denen Menschen—und Völkerschicksale abhängen, gilt die Liturgie als ein "feierliches Spiel", bei dem nichts geschieht. Können wir uns wundern, dass wirklichkeitshungrige Menschen, die den Entscheidungscharakter des Lebens mit allen Fasern ihres Seins empfinden und bejahen, sich von dem Ort eines unverbindlichen Spiels nach dem Schauplatz schicksalsträchtiger Entscheidungen sehnen?

Dieser unüberbrückbare Abstand trennt Liturgie und Entscheidung indes nur unter der Voraussetzung, dass ein ganz bestimmtes Verständnis der Liturgie zu Recht besteht: Liturgie als eine Reihe von Formen und Formeln, mit denen die Nüchternheit und Kahlheit des protestantischen Gottesdienstes überwunden werden soll; musikalischer und künstlerischer Schmuck, mit dem die Armut und Armseligkeit "angereichert" wird—so wie unsere Frauen einen kahlen Raum durch ein paar hübsche Vorhänge und einen bunten Blumenstrauss in ein wohnliches Heim verwandeln. Ob diese Dekoration da sein oder fehlen soll, ist dann eine Frage der Tradition, auch des persönlichen Geschmacks und der pädagogischen Zweckmässigkeit. Es gibt dann höchstens eine Entscheidung darüber, ob man im Gottesdienst eine "Liturgie" haben will oder nicht, und diese Entscheidung ist zumeist sehr willkürlich und in keinem Fall wesentlich. Dem gegenüber verstehen wir—mit der gesamten Kirche aller Jahrhunderte abgesehen von unseren Verfallszeiten—unter Liturgie die geordnete Form des gottesdienstlichen Handelns überhaupt, das Amt des Gebets und der liebenden Verehrung Gottes ("Kultus"), das mit den beiden andren Aemtern des lehrhaften Zeugnisses (martyria) und des Dienstes an der Gemeinschaft (diakonia) den Beruf der Kirche ausmacht. Liturgie ist der primär Gott zugewendete Dienst, der sich mit dem der Welt zugewendeten Dienst und dem Dienst der Christen untereinander zu einer unzerteilbaren Einheit verbindet.

Von dieser so verstandenen Liturgie sagen wir, das in ihr Entscheidungen getroffen werden und Entscheidungen fallen.

2. Es ist nützlich, von der Beobachtung auszugehen, dass wesentliche Entscheidungen der Kirche sich als *liturgische Entscheidungen* darstellen und als solche erkennbar werden.

Es gibt keine liturgische Frage, die nicht dogmatische Hintergründe und dogmatische Tragweite hätte, und es ist unsinnig, liturgische Formfragen entscheiden zu wollen, ohne sich über diese Hintergründe klar zu sein. Umgekehrt werden dogmatische Entscheidungen in ganz bestimmten liturgischen Einzelfragen vollzogen und sichtbar. Luthers Protest gegen den Opfer- und Verdienstcharakter der Messe wurde liturgisch vollzogen als die radikale Beseitigung des ganzen Offertoriums und aller den Vollzug eines Opfers bezeichnenden Stellen im Gefüge der Messe. Wesentliche Verschiedenheiten im Verständnis der Kirche, ja im Verständnis Gottes und seiner Offenbarung selbst werden praktisch wirksam in der sehr verschiedenen Stellung, die dem Altar im (wirklich!) lutherischen und im (wirklich!) reformierten Gottesdienst zukommt. Die verschiedene Stellung des Credo (in der Ostkirche im Zusammenhang des Opferaktes, im Abendland in der Nachbarschaft der Evangelienlesung) oder das Verhältnis des Sanctus und der Einsetzungsworte in der Ordnung der Abendmahlsfeier sind Fragen, in denen sehr tiefgreifende Entscheidungen im Verständnis, sei es des Glaubensbekenntnisses, sei es der Sakramentsfeier sich auswirken, auch wenn die, die diese Ordnung gebrauchen, sich dieser Entscheidungen gar nicht bewusst sind. Um zuletzt ein Beispiel aus der Römisch-katholischen Kirche zu geben: die heutige Bemühung, den Kommunion-Empfang in die Messhandlung selbst einzubeziehen, ist der notwendige liturgische Ausdruck für die Tatsache, dass als das eigentliche und wesentliche Geschehen der Messe nicht die Opferhandlung, sondern das Mahl erkannt wird (R. Guardini).

Das Kirchenvolk aller Konfessionen empfindet diese liturgischen Formen und ihre Aenderung als das, was sie eigentlich und unmittelbar berührt. Unsere Gemeinden sind zumeist erstaunlich tolerant gegenüber offenbaren Irrlehren, während liturgische Neuerungen die grössten Aufregungen hervorrufen können. Es ist kein Zweifel, dass reformierte Gemeinden gegen die Einführung lutherischer kirchlicher Ordnungen sehr viel empfindlicher wären als gegen lutherische Lehre, umgekehrt lutherische Gemeinden das Eindringen reformierter Sonderlehren vielleicht gar nicht wahrnehmen, umso mehr aber die Entleerung und Verarmung ihrer gottesdienstlichen Formen durch reformierte Gewohnheiten. Wer heute die säkular-barock-bürgerliche Amtstracht des protestantischen Pfarrers, der Weisung der Bekenntnisschriften gemäss, durch die liturgische Gewandung ersetzen will, wird sicher sehr viel grösseres Aufsehen erregen, ja ernstere Beunruhigung hervorrufen als durch alles, was etwa in seiner Predigt ungewohnt sein könnte. Es sind Beispiele aus der

Kirchengeschichte bekannt, wo, namentlich in der Ostkirche, die Kirche sich gespalten hat nicht um dogmatischer Unterschiede willen, sondern wegen verschiedener Praxis hinsichtlich der liturgischen Gebärden und Formulare.

Es wäre sehr töricht, diese Stellungnahme des Kirchenvolkes als sturen Konservatismus lächerlich zu machen, so dass ich der einzelne Pfarrer mit seinen persönlichen Geschmacksurteilen darüber hinwegsetzen dürfte. Vielleicht spricht sich darin ein unmittelbares Empfinden für einen tieferen Sachverhalt aus: dass nämlich in der Liturgie in Wahrheit etwas geschieht, und dass es eben deswegen sehr genau darauf ankommt, *was* hier geschieht; mehr selbst als auf die Frage, was im Rahmen einer Rede gesagt wird.

3. Es ist die entscheidend wichtige Erkenntnis, die wir *kultischen Realismus* gegenüber jeder nominalistischen Entmächtigung nennen, dass in der gesamten Liturgie nicht nur über etwas geredet, ein innerer Besitz "dargestellt" wird, sondern dass hier wirklich etwas geschieht: Die gemeinten Sachverhalte werden "beschworen", herbeigerufen, gegenwärtig gesetzt (nicht nur phantasiemässig "vergegenwärtigt"). Die Realpräsenz Christi ist das Grundgesetz aller Liturgie. Dass Gott gehandelt hat und dass in diesem seinem Handeln die Entscheidung schlechthin gefallen ist, das ist die unentbehrliche und keinen Augenblick wegzudenkende Voraussetzung; aber auf diese Entscheidung wird nicht nur erinnernd verwiesen, sondern sie vollzieht sich im Kultus als gegenwärtiges Ereignis. Das *Hodie* aller echten Liturgie hat nicht den Sinn eines Jubiläums ("heute vor 1900 Jahren . . ."), sondern den Sinn einer geladenen Gegenwart. Jedes Gebet meint und vollzieht eine wirkliche Verbindung zwischen Himmel und Erde. Die Art, wie Paulus I. Korinther 10 von "dem Brot, das wir brechen", und von dem gesegneten Kelch als der Gemeinschaft des Leibes und Blutes Christi redet, zeigt unmissverständlich seine Ueberzeugung, dass im Kultus—nicht nur im christlichen Kultus!—eine reale Kommunikation mit den Mächten und Kräften der himmlischen Welt geschieht. Wer teilnimmt, gerät damit in das Wirkfeld göttlicher oder widergöttlicher Mächte. Auch dass das Gotteslob der Liturgie in den Lobgesang der himmlischen Heerscharen einstimmt, ist ganz wörtlich und real zu verstehen.

Wenn das alles richtig ist, dann wird es freilich im gleichen Mass wichtig, mit wem wir uns im liturgischen Handeln verbinden. Wenn man Negatives meditiert, so gewinnt dieses Negative Macht über die Tiefenräume unserer Seele; wenn wir einen Kultus widergöttlicher Mächte vollziehen, dann über sie an uns ihre verderbliche und zerstörerische Macht. Von dieser Sorge her muss der ganze

Abwehrkampf der Kirche gegen die häretische Verfälschung der Wahrheit verstanden werden. Die Sorge um die Reinheit der Lehre ist keine Sorge um eine theoretische Wahrheit; verkehrte und törichte Dinge sind in der Welt viel gesagt, verkündigt und gelehrt worden, ohne wesentlichen Schaden anzurichten; sondern es ist im Grunde eine liturgische Frage: Mit welchen Inhalten verbinden wir uns in der Liturgie? Wovon werden unsere gottesdienstlichen Räume erfüllt? An welche Dinge geben wir uns hin? Welche Speise nehmen wir als Nahrung in uns auf? Das Credo ist der hymnische Ausdruck für die Adressen unserer Hingabe, die geordnete Rede von dem, dem wir uns unbedingt anvertrauen dürfen, ohne daran zu Schanden zu werden. Aber wenn es einen Widergott gibt, und wenn der Antichrist dem Christus zum Verwechseln ähnlich sieht, dann droht sehr ernsthaft die Gefahr, dass wir im Gewand eines christlichen Gottesdienstes eine "vermaledete Abgötterei" treiben; und vor dieser Abgötterei ist zu warnen, nicht weil sie "der Lehre der Kirche widerspricht", also theoretisch falsch ist, sondern weil sie dazu verführt, sich den "falschen Göttern" und ihrer grausamen Macht statt dem lebendigen Gott und seinem gnädigen Willen hinzugeben. Weil in der Liturgie wirklich etwas geschieht, darum ist sie umlauert von Gefahren und wird zu einer tödlichen Bedrohung für den, der die Wahrheit in Wahn verfälscht oder dem wahren und wirklichen Gott nicht in der gebührenden Haltung begegnet.

So fallen in der Liturgie echte Entscheidungen, und sie haben eine unerhörte Tragweite; hier geschieht etwas, was tief eingreift in das Gesamtgefüge des irdischen Lebens; denn es gilt und wirkt ja nicht nur das, was wir selbst in bewusster Entscheidung vollzogen haben, sondern auch das, was in der Tiefe unbewusster Vorgänge an uns geschieht. Dass wir wirklich getauft sind, dass wir an diesem Altar knien, dass in diesem Raum diese Botschaft laut wird, dass wir dieses Wort gehört haben, dass wir dieses Lied singen, dass diese Worte und diese Weisen durch das Medium unserer Stimme diesen Raum erfüllen, dass wir die heilige Speise wirklich essen und aus dem gesegneten Kelch trinken: dies alles sind echte Entscheidungen, nicht in erster Linie Entscheidungen, die wir treffen, sondern Entscheidungen, die an uns fallen. Diese *communicatio* bedeutet immer eine Entscheidung, die tief in unser eigenes Leben zurück- und durch uns hindurch in das Ganze der Welt hineinwirkt. Ob wir an den Mysterien Gottes oder an den Mysterien des Widergottes Anteil haben, diese Frage ist ein Stück der heimlichen Geschichte der Welt. Denn was wir im heiligen Raum tun, tun wir ja immer zugleich in objektiver Stellvertretung für andere. Wenn

der Verfasser der Pastoralbriefe mahnt (I. Tim. 2), Bitte, Gebet und Fürbitte und Danksagung zu tun "für alle Menschen, für die Könige und alle Obrigkeit",—so ruft er nicht nur auf zu bewusster und ausdrücklicher Fürbitte, sondern erinnert zugleich daran, dass das Gebet der Gemeinde ein stellvertretendes opus Dei ist, das "allen Menschen", den Königen und aller Obrigkeit zugut kommt, einerlei ob die "Könige" diesen priesterlichen Dienst suchen und schätzen. Insofern ist das Gebet an den Altären, die echte Liturgie ein geschichtsmächtiger Faktor allerersten Ranges: Die Reinigung des Tempels ist das Letzte, was der Herr zur Rettung seines Volkes tun kann, und der Verfall der Liturgie erzeugt ein Kraft-Vakuum, in das die unheimlichsten Mächte widerstandslos einströmen.

So gewiss die Liturgie Gott und nicht den Menschen zugewendet ist, so wenig will sie auf Gott wirken. Gott bedarf unseres Dienstes nicht, und Er führt Seinen Weltenplan mit uns oder gegen uns zum Ziel. Dennoch ist es auch für Gott nicht gleichgültig, ob Ihm Menschen den Dienst liebender Verehrung leisten oder nicht. Wir sollen, vielmehr wir dürfen, "etwas sein zum Lobe Seiner Herrlichkeit" (Epheser 1). So wie die Macht eines Herrschers objektiv gemehrt wird durch die Huldigungen, die ihm dargebracht werden, so wird Gottes Ehre vermehrt, wenn auf Erden Räume sind, in denen diese "Ehre" Gottes "wohnen" kann, und wenn da Menschen sind, die sich Ihm als Stimme und Hände zur Verfügung stellen. Alle Liturgie ist Danksagung in dem strengen Sinn, den das gratiam referre ausdrückt, dass die göttliche gratia zurückstrahlt und zurückschwingt zu ihrem Ursprung.

4. Erst von diesem Ereignischarakter der Liturgie aus wird dann auch verständlich, inwiefern die Liturgie *uns vor Entscheidungen stellt*. Es ist zunächst eine "entscheidende" Frage, ob ich "in die Kirche gehe" oder nicht, an diesem realen Geschehen teilnehme oder nicht. Vielleicht bleibe ich lieber fort, als dass ich mich dem aussetze, was dort geschieht. Hier wird scharf geschossen, und es ist kein Raum für Schlachtenbummler, die sich das bloss mal ansehen wollen. Die Liturgie ist im Zusammenhang eines geistlichen Kampfes ein Appell, bei dem ich in Reih und Glied stehen muss, damit nicht eine Lücke entsteht und der Platz im Gestühl leer bleibt, der auf mich wartet. Freilich, die Realität der Entscheidungen, die hier fallen, wird nicht aufgehoben, wenn ich persönlich versage; sie empfängt nur für mich ein anderes Vorzeichen, und was zu meinem Heil geschehen sollte, wendet sich gegen mich. Die Zuschauerhaltung, die sich nicht entscheiden, sondern unverbindlich bleiben möchte,

ist der eigentliche Missbrauch des göttlichen Namens; und "der Herr wird den nicht ungestraft lassen, der Seinen Namen missbraucht". Die gegenständliche Aussage in der 3. Person ist der Ausdruck dieses Abstandes, der unbeteiligt und unentschieden bleiben möchte; die 2. Person, die Anrede, allein ist dem entscheidungsvollen Ernst der Liturgie angemessen. Nicht der Nominativ, sondern der Vokativ ist die Grundform des göttlichen Namens. Es geschieht, wenn ich den Ruf zur Entscheidung vernehme und mich ihm beuge, immer das, was in der alten Form der Erwachsenenentaufe geschah: Ich sage ab dem Teufel und allen seinen Werken und wende mich bittend, lobpreisend, anbetend zu dem lebendigen Gott.

Diese echte Entscheidung für Gott und Seinen Christus schliesst jede verkehrte Haltung Gott gegenüber, jede Anmassung und jeden Anspruch vor Gott ebenso radikal aus wie die geistliche Selbst-Sucht die da bei sich selber bleiben und sich selber behaupten möchte, wo allein die Liebe gilt. Wo der Leib Christi nicht von anderen, innerweltlichen Vorgängen unterschieden und darum die Liebe verletzt wird, da wird in einer unwürdigen Weise gegessen und getrunken, und die Entscheidung verfehlt, zu der die Liturgie aufruft.

So wie Eltern ihre Kinder nicht durch Ermahnungen und Warnungen zu den nötigen Entscheidungen aufrufen, sondern dadurch, dass sie selbst ihre eigenen Entscheidungen in verantwortungsbewusster Weise treffen, so verfährt die Liturgie der Kirche mit uns. Sie stellt uns nicht durch fortwährende Appelle "in die Entscheidung" (was ja kein Mensch auf die Dauer aushält), sondern sie lässt uns ahnen, dass hier, an den Altären des Herrn, wirkliche Entscheidungen von unermesslicher Tragweite fallen, und überlässt es uns, durch die rechte Teilnahme an diesen Mysterien selbst die uns zufallenden Entscheidungen zu treffen. So also ist es gemeint, wenn wir gegenüber aller bloss ästhetischen Freude an reichen und schönen, auch ehrwürdigen Formen von dem Entscheidungscharakter aller echten Liturgie, ja von Liturgie als Entscheidung sprechen.

(ii)

(a) *Wort und Sakrament.*

Es ist in der lutherischen Kirche ueblich Wort und Sakrament als die zwei "Gnadenmittel" zu unterscheiden. Diese Unterscheidung wirkt sich auch aus in der Zweiteilung des Gottesdienstes in einen "Wort-Gottesdienst" und einen "Sakraments-Gottesdienst". Dabei besteht unzweifelhaft

eine Neigung das Wort staerker zu betonen als das Sakrament, und das Sakrament wesentlich vom Wort her, als eine andere Form des "Wortes" zu verstehen.

Manche Theologen sind allerdings bereit zuzugeben, dass das Wort und Sakrament einander fordern:

Das Sakrament bewahrt das Wort vor der Gefahr eine bloss intellektuelle Mitteilung zu werden; umgekehrt bewahrt das Wort das Sakrament vor der Gefahr in Magie und Zauberei zu entarten, die dem Menschen die persoerliche Verantwortung ersparen wu'den.

Nach meiner Meinung ist zuerst zu fragen ob diese ganze Unterscheidung von Wort und Sakrament dem Sachverhalt wirklich gerecht wird. Es giebt keine Ausdruecke im neuen Testament die die gleichen Unterscheidung im Auge haben.

Sowohl der Begriff des Logos wie der Begriff Mysterion umfasst beides. Die Uebersetzung von Mysterion mit sakramentum hat dazu beigetragen, dass der Begriff des Sakramentes viel enger ist, als der Begriff Mysterion, und dass das Wort der Kirche nicht mehr selbst sakramental verstanden wird, nicht mehr Mysterienrede ist. Das Verhaeltnis vom Wort und Sakrament muss auf dem Boden des biblischen Begriffs Mysterium neu durchdacht, und der Zusammenhang des "Wortes" mit dem Mysterion der Kirche neu erkannt werden.

(b) *Sakrament und Symbol.*

Das Wort Symbol ist mehrdeutig, und diese Unklarheit ist schuld an den vielen Streitigkeiten ueber den "symbolischen" Charakter des Sakramentes. Wer spiritualistisch denkt, sieht in dem Symbol nur eine "Zeichen", etwas Uneigentliches, in dem die Sache selber nicht gegenwaertig ist.

Diese Denkweise entspricht nicht dem biblischen Denken. Hier ist das Aeussere das Anzeichen, Symptom fuer eine geistliche Wirklichkeit. Das gilt ebenso bei den Heilungen Jesu wie bei dem was der Apostel Paulus ueber die Taufe oder ueber das Abendmahl lehrt. Hier ist immer ein leibliches und ein geistliches Geschehen so eng miteinander verbunden, dass man beides nicht voneinander trennen kann.

So verstanden ist alles Handeln der Kirche "symbolisch" ein leibhaftes Reden und Handeln als Traeger und Werkzeug eines geistlichen Geschehens. Wird dieser Zusammenhang zerrissen, dann entsteht entweder eine leere Zeremonie, bei der geistlich gar nichts geschieht, oder ein bloss geistiger Vorgang, fuer den es gleichgueltig ist, ober von irgen

welchem "symbolischen" Gebräuchen und Gebärden begleitet wird oder nicht.

Die Frage nach dem Verhaeltnis von Sakrament und Symbol kann also nicht beantwortet werden, ohne dass vorher das Verstaendnis des Symbols selbst geklaert wird, und diese Frage haengt wieder ab von der Bedeutung der Liebhaftigkeit fuer das Verstaendnis des heiligen Geistes. Der Spiritualismus, der das Symbol entwertet, ist eine Verleugnung der Inkarnation, eine Verwechslung des "heiligen Geistes" mit blosser Geistigkeit, und wird dem Wesen des Sakramentes nicht gerecht.

(c) *Opfer und Priesterschaft.*

Die Reformation hatte einen so tiefen Eindruck von dem Eindringen und der Herrschaft einer nicht christlichen Opfer- und Priester-Idee in der christlichen Kirche, dass sie glaubte, beide Begriffe ganz vermeiden zu muessen. Von daher ist es auch in der lutherischen Kirche weithin ueblich geworden, den Opfer-Gedanken aus der Eucharistie gaenzlich zu tilgen und den priesterlichen Charakter des geistlichen Amtes zugunsten des allgemeinen Priestertums und des blossen Predigtamtes zu missachten.

Es ist zu fragen ob es uns erlaubt ist, Begriffe, die im Neuen Testament eine so grosse Rolle spielen wie der Begriff des Opfers, nur deswegen gaenzlich zu meiden, weil sie im Laufe der Kirchengeschichte verfaelscht und missbraucht worden sind.

Der biblische Begriff des Opfers wird in dreifacher Weise angewendet:

- (1) Fuer die Gaben der Liebe (Hebr. 13, 16).
- (2) Auf das Bekenntnis als Lobopfer (Hebr. 13, 15).
- (3) Auf die Hingabe des ganzen leiblichen Wesens (Romer 12, 1).

In all diesen drei Beziehungen gehoert das Opfer notwendig zu dem christlichen Gottesdienst.

Der Begriff des Priesters wird im Neuen Testament nicht auf bestimmte Aemter oder Fonktionen sondern nur auf den Beruf aller Christen angewendet (I. Peter 2).

Es ist darum von dem priesterlichen Amt jeder Christen und von dem priesterlichen Charakter des geistlichen Amtes, aber nicht von einem Amtspriestertum zu reden.

Mit alle dem wird nicht beschrieben, was in der lutherischen Kirche in Deutschland allgemeine Ueberzeugung ist, sondern es werden die Fragen aufgedeckt, die neu gestellt und beantwortet werden muessen, und die Richtung,

in der, nach der Meinung des Verfassers, die Antwort gesucht werden muss.

DR. MACDONALD asked how far Geiselmann of Tübingen's theory of dynamic symbolism, which had struck him as extremely fruitful, had been taken up in German circles. DR. SCHÖNFELD replied that unfortunately very few German theologians could have got hold of the book. During the last ten years, theological discussion had been badly disrupted and they had been out of touch with recent contributions from within Germany as well as from without. He was sure that contact with the Liturgical Movement would be widely welcomed as most helpful in this reconstruction period.

MR. LE QUESNE pointed out that, where the Eucharist was described by saying that the bread and wine were purely symbolic, those who said so would not in any way intend to deny the doctrine of the Incarnation. THE CHAIRMAN said that surely what Bishop Stählin meant was that to take the Incarnation seriously gave an altogether deeper reality to all material things, that it was a wrong conception to think that we have to get away from the material in order to be spiritual. PASTOR MAURY wished to make two points. (i) They did not want to be led by liturgy beyond what they could conscientiously do, and Bishop Stählin's papers led them too quickly in directions they could not follow. In his statement, for example, that the New Testament never divorced sacrament from sacrifice, there was an ambiguity which should make them cautious. As Reformed churchmen, they would speak of the Eucharist as a sacrifice of praise, but not as in any sense expiatory; they believed that there was only one such sacrifice offered for them and not by them, and they must not lose their hold on their faith through being carried away by the Liturgical Movement. (ii) The relationship of the universal to the special priesthood was not to be settled by two or three quotations from the New Testament. It was not good to make *rapprochements* on liturgical grounds without thorough theological and doctrinal understanding. PROFESSOR CLAVIER said that he was largely in agreement with Pastor Maury, though he did not find so many difficulties in Bishop Stählin's teaching, especially when read in connection with his earlier treatment of Word and Sacrament in the volume published in preparation for the Edinburgh Conference. His way of putting things did not strike him as so objectionable, so long as they did not press the idea so far as to make the conception of *signum* magical. PROFESSOR ZANDER said that everything in the Church had a symbolical character, every word was a symbol in so far as there was reality behind it. The

liturgy was where heaven and earth met. God and man met in Christ, who is the perfect symbol. He agreed with Bishop Stählin, but thought he did not go far enough. PROFESSOR DE SAUSSURE welcomed Bishop Stählin's criticism of "spiritualism" which was one of the greatest heresies, but he was afraid of the word "symbol" because it was so often used to mean simply representation. He would prefer to follow Calvin and use the term *signe*, "qui livre la réalité". THE REV. MARTTI PARVIO said that the Eucharist was a *mysterion*. In the Eucharist there was the whole history of salvation; in that sense he believed in it as a sacrifice. In the Eucharist they sing "Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mundi" because it is happening now, it is present, not past, it is the key-point of all the sacramental rite.

III.

The Commission on Intercommunion.

(i) REPORT BY PROFESSOR D. M. BAILLIE.

The European section of the Commission was only appointed in February, 1946. It held a meeting at Clarens last summer. There was an informal meeting of British members in Oxford in May of this year and we had another meeting yesterday. I am now proposing the addition of four new members. (See above, page 25.)

Our plan is to produce a book to be published in 1951. It is to contain four parts:—

- I. The Report of the Commission to be used as the basis of discussion at the next World Conference.
- II. A short history of the problem of intercommunion from the Early Church down to the present time: four chapters covering the different periods written by different scholars, carefully selected.
- III. A collection of theological essays on principles underlying practices.
- IV. Appendix: statements of present practice expanding pamphlets 98 and 99.

Part III. will be the most important part of the book. We are approaching some twelve to sixteen scholars from as wide a variety of communions as possible, not asking them to reproduce the views of their Churches, but to make original contributions which shall attempt to go deeper down below mere practices and rules to the underlying theological principles which should govern our thinking in this matter. Our method is to explain the general idea and then give

carte blanche to each author. We have drawn up our list and propose to ask for the essays to be sent in within a year from now. That should enable us to collect, consider and arrange them in 1950 and publish in 1951.

(ii) PAPER BY THE REV. DR. JOHN MARSH ON
COMMUNION IN CONGREGATIONAL CHURCHES.

Practice:—Congregationalists join with the whole church in confessing their belief in “one holy catholic and apostolic Church”. They hold that this universal Church of Jesus Christ receives local embodiment wherever there is a true gospel church. They maintain that a true gospel church is found wherever a church consists of a fellowship or body of people, properly constituted of minister (presbyter), deacons and people, among whom, as a continuous part of their life, the Word of God is faithfully preached, the gospel sacraments duly administered, and whose members submit themselves to one another in Godly discipline, both in the church meeting and in their whole life together as fellow-members of one society. To such a Church as a whole, minister, officers and people together, is given the power and authority to celebrate the sacraments. In the life of these churches, even to-day, so central and important is the Lord’s Supper held to be that membership is often tested by the attendance of members at that Service, and we may well conclude that the rules governing the participation of members from other churches express a similar concern for the centrality and significance of that Service.

Our practice of “the open table” consists in two acts. The first takes place in what Maxwell has called “The Liturgy of the Word”, when the minister announces that the Service is a sacramental Service and invites to share with the members in the act of communion “any members of Christ’s Church, no matter to what branch of it they may belong”. The second occurs during the subsequent “Liturgy of the Upper Room” when the minister “fences the table”, i.e., in a more or less fully explicit way he exhorts each person remaining for communion to examine himself before partaking of the bread and wine, lest he eat and drink unworthily.

Significance:—You will observe two things: (i) The invitation is universal in its reach to all members of Christ’s Church present: the sacrament is in this sense catholic, universal, in intention. (ii) The fencing of the table is intended to secure a “pure” celebration, i.e., to ensure that none eats or drinks unworthily. Catholicity and purity are the two ends that our practice seeks to secure.

Now clearly the open invitation is directed to a situation envisaged by the term "intercommunion". The formula of words we use has not been devised to set up Godly disciplines for the members of the local church, since it knows very well who among its adherents are members, and therefore entitled to communicate. The formula is meant to let members of other Churches know that they too are welcome at the Lord's table. But the second formula, the "fencing of the table", is directed to local church members and visitors alike. However well the pastor may know his sheep, he will not know them as God knows them, or perhaps, in some respects, as they know themselves. Even if no visitor be present in the church, the table must be fenced. Each member is under obligation to Christ to examine himself. But not only each member, but each visitor, too, needs to undergo self-examination and among the questions a visitor must ask himself—and answer—is one about the propriety of his communicating in that church. So the Church issues an open invitation, but it cannot, therefore, accept responsibility for the answers given either by members of the local church or by any visitors. Each participant must accept that responsibility for himself. Catholicity and purity are sought and, we trust, ensured.

Theology:—In attempting to explain these practices theologically I want to make two remarks. First, I cannot pretend that the answer I give to the question as to the theological significance of our general practice is the one that would be given by every minister of my Church past and present. But I do not think that is a reason for not making my answer, because theology, in one perfectly valid aspect, may be defined as the Church making the meaning of her actions clear to herself.

I think our first theological comment on our action would be that it is fully biblical. Jesus invited His community of twelve, all of it, to share the first Lord's Supper together. The Church cannot do less than invite every member of His family present to share the same meal. Second, St. Paul is clear in his injunction that every member so present must try and examine himself. It is not the Church's duty to try and examine him. The Church invites: the member examines. Precept and example of the highest kind give us our authority for our open but fenced table.

Behind this biblical warrant there lies, if I mistake not, a far deeper issue. I think it may be expressed by saying that, after all is said and done, Christ is the host at that feast, not the Church. It is Christ who issues the invitation

to "come and dine". Were we to contemplate making regulations to establish barriers here, we should seem to ourselves to be usurping Christ's place as host, to be acting *Christo absente*. There is further the obverse of this comment, viz., that were we to frame ecclesiastical regulations to exclude certain Christians from other Churches we should feel that we were usurping their responsibility for self-examination in the matter, and so again acting as a true Church neither could nor should. These convictions may well spring out of our dissent from any attempt to recognise Christ "locally" in the sacrament, and our assertion that it is in the whole sacramental action that he mediates himself: so that even in the ministry of the Word, when the minister issues the open invitation, it is in theological or religious reality neither he nor the Church that speaks it, but Christ himself. However that may be, there are certain conclusions to be drawn from our custom in regard to the relationship of Churches to one another. Probably our practice began at a time when visitors to communion were members of other Congregational churches. No change has been made now that we often have visitors from other communions—Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists and Anglicans, to name the chief. This means that for us the problem of our relations in intercommunion are in principle the same for members of any other church no matter to what denomination it may belong. Suppose that some Congregational church had so misbehaved itself that the Union of Congregational Churches had withdrawn from fellowship with it: suppose that a member from that church were present in my congregation on Communion Sunday. I dare not assume to judge that member as unworthy to partake with us in the bread and wine. He might have been an unwilling participant in that part of his church's life; he may not have been able to share in it. He may have shared in it and come to my church because he has now repented. I dare not do other than keep my invitation open and "fence the table". He, not I, must accept the responsibility for his subsequent acceptance or refusal. In principle this applies to members from any church that calls itself Christian. Unless, as the officiating Minister, I can deal with an acknowledged irregularity beforehand, I cannot do other than leave things to each man's conscience in the sight of God.

This does not mean that we disregard the question of the relation of churches to one another as insignificant or unimportant. On the contrary, we have stated very clearly that not to have true catholic interest in Christ's body, the whole Church, is to be a schismatical, a false Church. But the

question of the relation of communions to one another as churches or denominations is, we should hold, of a different order from that of the admission of individuals to the Lord's table. The latter need not and should not wait upon the former. It is one thing for two denominations or communions to agree that their members shall have and enjoy mutual rights of access to sacraments and other offices of the Church, as the Anglican Church has agreed with various Churches in Europe. For that inter-Church communion (*koinonia*) the whole range of problems in doctrine, in regard to the ministry and sacraments, has to be faced. But intercommunion is not, I think, exhausted by its reference to negotiations on a high level. It refers also to things that happen every month in our churches—and very frequently in many others—when a member of another communion is present when the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion is announced. Intercommunion that consists of the admission of Christ's members to His table is, in our view, the inescapable duty of every true Church. So our practice points to the desirability of distinguishing between intercommunion as agreement between denominations and intercommunion as the practice of local churches in a given place. Congregational churches have intercommunion with each other in the first sense. They have intercommunion for all in the latter. We hold it as a serious error to offer Christ to but a selected number of His members.

There are many other points that could be pursued out of this examination. The significance of the ministry and the laity for the sacrament, the relations and duties of the minister to his church and to Christ the Head of the whole Church, the nature of sacramental action, etc., etc. I want to conclude with a brief reference to one other point. We have sometimes rejoiced that baptism is the one "catholic", i.e., universal sacrament; i.e., it is the one sacrament that each Church accepts from every other (though there are, I believe, some few exceptions even to this admirable rule). But can there be a sacrament that is not universal? I think this is the issue our practice raises. Certainly a sacrament must also be "pure" in the sense that only the authorised must come. Our conviction remains of necessity that the adoption of ecclesiastical regulations about admission of members from other denominations, while intended to secure purity, would fail to ensure that end, both in excluding some true members of Christ and perhaps encouraging false ones, whereas an open invitation together with a fencing of the table preserves both catholicity and purity, so far as these can be preserved by human foresight and action.

PROFESSOR FLOROVSKY asked for more information about the formula used for fencing the table. What kind of conditions disqualified? Were they only moral or were doctrinal standards also required in self-examination? Were certain conceptions of the Church implied in the formula itself? On what authority, biblical or otherwise, was the formula based? Was it in scriptural language, and, if not, how was it authoritative? DR. MARSH replied that the formula varied in different Calvinist liturgies, e.g., John Knox's Geneva Prayer Book, the Middelburg Prayer Book, the Books of Church Order of the Church of Scotland, etc. The fencing of the table was largely a matter of moral exhortation, but could not be separated from the whole context in which there were words reminding people of faith in our Lord Jesus Christ as a condition of coming to communion. Nowadays, in most churches the formula quoted the scriptural words in I. Cor. xi.

MAR THEODOSIUS said that many of them were disappointed that they could not communicate together with all their fellow Christians. Intercommunion was the mark of the organic unity of the Church and they could not have it while they were still divided. It required unity in faith and doctrine. Since the division between East and West, there had not been that unity, and intercommunion while divided was a pretence that things were not what they were. They must keep bound together in love and work for that unity in faith and doctrine which should enable them to communicate together. PROFESSOR CLAVIER emphasised that the Holy Supper was for sinners, "une médecine pour les pauvres malades". In the history of the French Reformed churches, circumstances had sometimes made necessary an examination by the pastor and the giving of a token to those to be admitted to communion. PROFESSOR ZANDER referred to Dr. Marsh's point about the table being the table of the Lord and Christ the Host. In the Orthodox hymn for Holy Thursday, this was stated explicitly. But if the Lord alone was concerned, why have the minister at all? Why should not a layman celebrate privately in his family? But then what of the minister's responsibility to fence the table and not admit unworthy or un-Orthodox members? It was impossible to avoid the complications referred to by Mar Theodosius. THE BISHOP OF LICHFIELD was thankful that the Commission was going to wrestle afresh with the theology of the problem. The question was bound up with that of the Church and the ministry. He wanted to ask who, in the Congregational churches, were commissioned to celebrate the sacrament. He had always understood that they held

that, in the last resort, laymen were competent. What was the actual usual arrangement? He also wanted to ask how the authors in Part III. could really make fresh and original contributions, seeing that they would all belong to their Churches. DR. MARSH replied that, according to classical Congregationalism, celebrating was not a right of laymen; the commission was given to the whole Church and the whole Church, i.e., minister, presbytery and laity, if unable to function as it should owing to persecution or some other cause, could authorise some member not in the ministry to celebrate. DR. BAILLIE added that in Part III. they were asking scholars to do what had never yet been done. Of course, they would write from the stand-point of their Churches, but they were asking men who were likely to have original thought on the subject.

DR. SCHÖNFELD asked whether it was generally known how important this question was in the recent Eisenach Conference. It was the crucial point in the discussion whether the Churches represented there could stay together. The work of the Commission might be of real value to the German Evangelical Church.

How far would conditions of emergency situations be taken into account in the fundamental theological study work? In Germany, for four or five years there was often no pastor available; the Lutheran Church had to authorise laymen to celebrate. And troops before action would go to receive and did receive communion from any celebrant present, Lutheran, Reformed or Roman Catholic. Might not such circumstances come again? Should they not be taken into account?

DR. FLEW welcomed Prof. Baillie's projected valuable work that had never yet been done. He suggested that in 1950 the Commissions on the Church and on Intercommunion should meet where there could be contact between them. He wanted to ask Dr. Marsh if the Congregational formula for fencing the table included, as in Methodism, the three indispensable elements of (i) earnest repentance, (ii) love and charity, (iii) intention towards holiness. These were not merely moral but religious, Christian, revelational all through. To Prof. Zander he would suggest that the position of the minister must be safeguarded against the doctrine of the indispensability of a priest. He remembered how, in Westminster Abbey in 1933, Bishop Palmer, after criticising that doctrine in biting words as not in origin a Christian doctrine, but come over from paganism, then went on to say that the rule of the Church of England by which the celebrant must be a priest was a very good rule. In

Methodism, they proceeded by the catholic method of dispensation: to save their people from being deprived of the sacrament, the President of the Conference every year signed a very limited number of such dispensations, authorising carefully selected laymen to act in such cases of necessity.

THE REV. KENNETH RICHES felt a growing impression of the need of the closest possible interchange of views between the three Commissions. When they considered intercommunion by itself, their practices sometimes seemed harsh and uncharitable. But they all practised, if not intercommunion, the giving of communion in cases of need. For example, in his parish, he had communicated a German Roman Catholic and a German Lutheran kneeling side by side. In all such cases, the sacrament was essentially a Church act and behind the practice lay the doctrine of the Church. At Amsterdam they found the deepest division there. To communicate at a Congregational Service would, for him, involve accepting a doctrine of the Church which he could not honestly do. They had to see the act of communion in the context of the whole liturgy and the liturgy in the whole life and doctrine of the Church. THE REV. O. S. TOMKINS said that, as Secretary to the Amsterdam Assembly Committee on Worship, he was disappointed that they had not succeeded in having any real Assembly worship and there had been a sense of frustration among some in connection with the four Eucharists. Their plans had been made on certain principles which had not been made sufficiently clear to all the delegates. The Central Committee was keeping in existence its committee to study these needs. He wanted to ask if the Commission on Ways of Worship was getting on with its study of the meaning of œcumenical worship, the fact that they prayed together at all. They seemed to take that for granted, but the Roman Catholic refusal should make them realise that they took for granted something very important and what should they do with regard to the Eucharist while still separated? Could the Commissions help them to see what they should do in planning for their œcumenical worship?

DR. FLOROVSKY asked Prof. Clavier if what he described was really not open communion, but communion only open to those who gave satisfaction on definite doctrinal grounds. In the formula used at the Reformed celebration in Amsterdam, those who practised invocation of saints were classified with adulterers and stealers in the warning not to communicate—was not that communion open only to a certain category distinguished on doctrinal grounds? How did that differ from their Orthodox practice? PROFESSOR CLAVIER

replied that the language they used was not to be taken absolutely literally; of course, no communion was entirely open. Equally, of course, there were some doctrinal requirements and only those could be admitted to communion who were members of some Church in which they had received proper instruction. In Calvinistic churches that instruction was largely doctrinal, but the necessary doctrine was that of the two fundamental points without which a man could not properly be a Christian, the authority of Holy Scripture in matters of faith and justification by faith in Jesus Christ who died for our sins and rose for our justification. Those two points were essential for any Christian to make his communion; other requirements, such as those of ministerial order, were not so important. THE REV. E. A. PAYNE said that, as a Baptist, he spoke for a communion very close to Dr. Marsh's, but he would put some things with a different emphasis. Baptists would say to Prof. Zander that the table was not only the Lord's, but also the Church's. Yesterday, Dr. Craig had spoken of doctrines of the Church as sociologically conditioned. Certainly Church practice was historically conditioned and their practice had changed as historical conditions and spiritual needs had changed. Their present practice, as compared with that in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, had changed. They did not now close the table as then. The open invitation was not given until the middle of the nineteenth century; it was a modern thing due to the industrial revolution and the evangelistic necessities in industrial areas. When it came in, it was not expected that anyone would be present except those brought up in their own Protestant tradition. Now congregations were much more mixed and none of their theories had been formed to meet the circumstances of the present day. They needed guidance from the Commission, for some of their theories and their language did not fit present circumstances. CANON ARCHDALL criticised the common use of the word intercommunion to mean the act of intercommunicating. In a very real and deep sense, all Christians in all Churches were in communion with one another, as they realised in their common conviction that they ought to pray for one another. This they could do as they were; but intercommunicating, as a Church act, must be a costing thing, and they had to ask themselves what price they were prepared to pay.

DR. MARSH briefly replied to the discussion, saying that the Congregational practice of the relatively "open" table which he had described had not been adopted as a short cut to unity, but from certain deep principles which he had tried to expound.

INDEX OF RESOLUTIONS PASSED.

	PAGE
Approval of Constitution	21
Membership of Commission	21, 25
Representation of Churches	21, 25
Appointment of Officers, Theological Commissions and Executive Committee	21
Retirement of Treasurers, Mr. Parvin and Canon Tatlow	22
Membership of Theological Commissions ...	10, 24
American Theological Committee	24, 36
Expenditure Budget	23
Next Meeting	20

CONSTITUTION.

As approved by the Commission on September 8th, 1948, and submitted for final adoption to the Central Committee of the Council.

TITLE.

1. The Commission shall be called the Commission on Faith and Order of the World Council of Churches.

MEANINGS.

2. In this Constitution
The Commission means the above-named Commission on Faith and Order of the World Council of Churches.
The Executive Committee means the Executive Committee of the Commission on Faith and Order.
The Council means the above-named World Council of Churches.
The Assembly means the Assembly of the World Council.
The Central Committee means the Central Committee of the World Council.

DUTIES.

3. The duties of the Commission are:—
 - (i) To make a thorough study of those differences in the faith and order of the Churches which are obstacles to their full unity, and of the possible ways to overcome these differences, this task to be carried out through the work of Theological Commissions as hereafter provided which shall prepare material to be submitted to World Conferences on Faith and Order.
 - (ii) To proclaim the essential oneness of the Church of Christ and the obligation of the Churches to manifest that unity so that they may not only work together, but live together as members of the one Body of Christ; and to keep the Churches fully informed of all developments relating to the union of Churches in all parts of the world.

- (iii) To inform the Council when in the judgment of the Commission its studies have reached a point where the Churches should be invited to send chosen representatives to consider them at a World Conference on Faith and Order specially convened for that purpose.
4. All activities of the Commission shall be in accordance with the four principles of the Faith and Order Movement, viz:—
- (i) Its main work is to draw Churches out of isolation into conference, in which none is to be asked to be disloyal to or to compromise its convictions, but to seek to explain them to others while seeking to understand their points of view. Irreconcilable differences are to be recorded as honestly as agreements. (ii) Its conferences are to be conferences of delegates officially appointed by the Churches to represent them. (iii) The invitation to take part in these conferences is addressed to all Christian Churches throughout the world which accept our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour. (iv) Only Churches themselves are competent to take actual steps towards reunion by entering into negotiations with one another. The work of the Movement is not to formulate schemes and tell the Churches what they ought to do, but to act as the handmaid of the Churches in the preparatory work of clearing away misunderstandings, discussing obstacles to reunion, and issuing reports which are submitted to the Churches for their consideration.
5. While the Commission shall be free to undertake such studies as it shall decide to be required by 3. (i) above, it shall only appoint further Theological Commissions in co-operation with the Council's Study Department.

MEMBERSHIP.

6. The original members of the Commission shall be the members of the Continuation Committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order at the time of the adoption of the constitution of the World Council of Churches. Until such another World Conference be held as provided for in 3. (iii) above, vacancies shall be filled by the Assembly or the Central Committee, with due regard to adequate representation of confessional view-points and of the Churches concerned. When such a World Conference is held, it shall nominate to the Council the list of those to be appointed to the Council's post-Conference Commission on Faith and Order.

7. The Commission shall include among its members
 - A Chairman
 - Not more than five Vice-Chairmen
 - A Secretary
 - Not more than three Associate Secretaries, one of whom shall be the Theological Secretary
 - The Chairmen, Vice-Chairmen and Secretaries of the Theological Commissions.
8. The Commission shall elect an Executive Committee.
9. The officers enumerated in paragraph 7 above shall together be known as the Council's Faith and Order Department.

MEETINGS OF THE COMMISSION.

10. The Commission shall meet as often as the Executive Committee shall convene it, but not more than once a year.
11. The Chairman of the Commission shall preside at meetings of the Commission, or in his absence one of the Vice-Chairmen present. In the absence of these officers, the meeting shall elect its own Chairman. One sixth of the total membership shall constitute a quorum.
12. The notices of meetings shall be issued by the Secretary. The Executive Committee can authorise the Secretary in consultation with the Chairman to convene a meeting at their discretion or to fix the time and place of any meeting.
13. Members of the Commission can name substitutes to represent them at meetings at which they are unable to be present themselves.
14. On questions of Faith and Order the Commission shall not adopt any resolutions, but shall confine itself to recording for the information of the Churches such agreements and disagreements as are discovered.
15. Questions of procedure and the conduct of the business of the Commission shall be decided by a majority vote of those present and voting.
16. The Executive Committee may, either at a meeting of the Commission or previously, determine the rules of procedure and of debate for the meeting.
17. Persons not being members of the Commission may be invited by the Chairman or the Secretary to be present and speak, but they cannot vote.

CHAIRMAN.

18. The Chairman shall be elected by a majority of votes at a duly convened meeting of the Commission, on the nomination of the Executive Committee.
19. The Chairman shall hold office for three years from the date of his appointment, but shall be eligible for re-election.
20. In the event of the office of Chairman falling vacant by reason of resignation, incapacity or death, one of the Vice-Chairmen shall be elected by the Executive Committee to act as Chairman of the Commission until such time as a meeting of the Commission can be called.

VICE-CHAIRMEN.

21. The number of Vice-Chairmen may be determined from time to time by the Commission provided that the number of five be not exceeded.
22. A Vice-Chairman shall be elected by the Commission on the nomination of the Executive Committee, shall hold office for three years, and shall be eligible for re-election.

THE SECRETARIAT.

23. The Secretary shall be a member of the staff of the Council employed on a full-time basis.
24. The Secretary shall be nominated by the Commission to the Central Committee.
25. The Secretary shall be appointed for a term of two years and shall be eligible for re-election for such period as the Commission shall recommend to the Central Committee.
26. It shall be the especial responsibility of the Secretary to maintain full consultation and co-operation with the General Secretariat and with the other Departments of the Council, and particularly with the Study Department.
27. The Associate Secretaries shall be nominated by the Executive Committee after consultation with the Council and shall be appointed by the Commission. They shall hold office for three years and be eligible for re-election.
28. The duty of the Theological Secretary shall be to assist and co-ordinate the work of the Theological Commissions, and to promote the co-ordination of their work with that of the Council's Study Department.

29. The salaries or honoraria to be paid to the Secretary and the Associate Secretaries shall be determined by the Executive Committee in consultation with the officers of the Council.

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

30. The Executive Committee shall consist of the members of the Department together with not more than ten members elected by the Commission and shall have power to co-opt not more than three members in addition.
31. The elected and co-opted members shall hold office for three years and shall be eligible for re-election and renewed co-option.
32. The duty of the Executive Committee shall be to determine the time and place and to prepare the business for meetings of the Commission, and to act on behalf of the Commission in all matters where action is required before a meeting of the Commission can be convened.
33. The Executive Committee shall meet at such times and places as the Chairman and the Secretary shall decide to be required for the performance of its duty.
34. The quorum for a meeting of the Executive Committee shall be seven members present, of whom at least three must be elected members.
35. If at any time when it is inconvenient to convene a meeting the Chairman and Secretary shall decide that there is business needing an immediate decision by the Executive Committee, it shall be permissible for them to obtain by post the opinions of its members and the majority opinion thus ascertained shall be treated as equivalent to the decision of a duly convened meeting.

THE DEPARTMENT.

36. The Department shall be responsible for continuously carrying on the work of the Commission between meetings of the Commission and the Executive Committee, both by (i) promoting the studies of the Theological Commissions and (ii) following all developments in the matter of the union of Churches and keeping all the Churches informed of these developments. It shall maintain full consultation and co-operation with the Study Department of the Council.
37. The Secretary shall be the only officer of the Commission employed by the Council on a full-time basis; the other members of the Department shall be persons

giving part-time service to the Commission whilst being also actively engaged in the service of their own Churches.

THE THEOLOGICAL COMMISSIONS.

38. Theological Commissions shall be appointed for the study of such subjects as the Commission shall refer to them in accordance with paragraphs 3. (i) and 5 above.
39. The work of the Theological Commissions shall be to prepare reports on the subjects referred to them under paragraph 38 to form agenda for Conferences on Faith and Order summoned in accordance with 3. (iii) above. These reports shall be presented in the first instance to the Commission which shall be responsible for preparing the Conference programme.
40. Each Theological Commission shall be composed of a Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Secretary with other members chosen for their special competence in the particular field of study and representing as wide a variety as possible of ecclesiastical traditions. The Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Secretary shall be appointed by the Commission, and they shall then select and appoint the other members in consultation with the Secretary and the Theological Secretary.

THE BUDGET.

41. The Commission's financial year shall run from 1st January to 31st December.
42. An annual budget of expenditure shall be drawn up by the Secretary in consultation with the Finance Committee of the Council; it shall be submitted to the Executive Committee for its approval and when so approved shall be submitted to the Council for final adoption. Copies shall then be sent to all members of the Commission.
43. The budget shall specify the amount allocated for the expenses of each Theological Commission, and each Theological Commission shall be responsible for deciding its manner of using its allocation within the limit prescribed in the budget.

REVISION.

44. Any amendment to this Constitution must be approved by the Assembly or Central Committee of the Council, but no amendment shall be valid which contravenes the provisions of paragraph 4 above or of this paragraph.

OFFICERS.

- THE RT. REV. YNGVE T. BRILJOTH, D.D., Bishop of Växjö, Sweden.
Chairman.
- THE RT. REV. BISHOP AULÉN, PASTOR MARC BOEGNER, REV. DR. R. NEWTON FLEW, THE MOST REV. ARCHBISHOP GERMANOS, REV. DR. DOUGLAS HORTON, *Vice-Chairmen.*
- REV. O. S. TOMKINS, *Secretary.*
- REV. DR. L. HODGSON, *Theological Secretary.*
- REV. DR. F. W. TOMKINS, *Associate Secretary in America.*
- REV. DR. R. NEWTON FLEW, PROF. DR. G. VAN DER LEEUW, REV. DR. HUGH THOMSON KERR, REV. PROF. D. M. BAILLIE, *Chairmen of Commissions.*

MEMBERS.

- Prof. Dr. Alfred Adam, German Evangelical Church.
- Rev. R. Adams, Church of Ireland.
- Prof. Hamilcar S. Alivisatos, D.D., Orthodox Church of Greece.
- Rev. Gustaf A. Ankar, Theol. Lic., Church of Sweden.
- Rev. Canon H. K. Archdall, Church in Wales.
- Rev. Robert A. Ashworth, D.D., Northern Baptist Convention, U.S.A.
- Pastor Hans Asmussen, D.D., German Evangelical Church.
- Rev. Dr. M. E. Aubrey, C.H., Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland.
- Dr. Samuel H. Baer, General Council of the Congregational and Christian Churches, U.S.A.
- Rev. G. C. Barber, B.D., Methodist Church of Australasia.
- Most Rev. Archbishop Antonios Bashir, Syrian Greek Orthodox Church.
- Rev. Prof. C. J. I. Bergendoff, B.D., Ph.D., Evangelical Lutheran Augustana Synod of North America.
- Rt. Rev. Bishop Berggrav, D.D., Church of Norway.
- Prof. Dr. S. F. H. J. Berkelbach v.d. Sprenkel, Reformed Church of the Netherlands.
- Rt. Rev. D. B. Blackwood, Bishop of Gippsland, Church of England in Australia and Tasmania.
- Prof. Dr. P. Boendermaker, Evangelical Lutheran Church of the Netherlands.
- Baron C. W. Th. van Boetelaer v. Dubbeldam, D.D., Reformed Church of the Netherlands.
- Rev. H. R. T. Brandreth, Church of England.
- Howard H. Brinton, Religious Society of Friends of Philadelphia and Vicinity.
- Rt. Rev. L. W. B. Broughall, D.D., Bishop of Niagara, Church of England in Canada.
- Rev. Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert, Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.
- Prof. Eugène Choisy, D.D., Fédération des Eglises Protestantes de la Suisse.
- Most Rev. Christophoros, Archbishop of all Albania and Metropolitan of Tirana-Durazzo, Orthodox Church of Albania.
- Most Rev. Metropolitan Chrysantos of Trebizond, Orthodox Church of Greece.
- Prof. H. Clavier, Reformed Evangelical Church of France.
- Rev. J. Harry Cotton, D.D., Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.
- Rt. Rev. Bishop George H. Cranswick, D.D., Church of England in Australia.
- Commissioner A. G. Cunningham, Salvation Army.
- Rev. J. R. Cunningham, D.D., Presbyterian Church in the United States.

Rev. Principal W. A. Curtis, D.D., D.Litt., Church of Scotland.
 Bischof D. Dr. Otto Dibelius, German Evangelical Church.
 Most Rev. Dionysios, Metropolitan of Warsaw, Volhynia and all
 Poland, Orthodox Church of Poland.
 Rev. Prof. C. H. Dodd, D.D., Congregational Union of England
 and Wales.
 Rev. Canon J. A. Douglas, Ph.D., Church of England.
 Rev. H. Paul Douglass, D.D., General Council of the Congrega-
 tional and Christian Churches, U.S.A.
 Rt. Rev. Bishop Angus Dun, D.D., Protestant Episcopal Church
 in the U.S.A.
 Fil. Mag. Ansgar Egg-Olofsson, Congregational Church of Sweden.
 Rev. William Eveleigh, Methodist Church of South Africa.
 Prof. Dr. Franz Fischer, Evangelical Lutheran Church in Austria.
 Most Rev. Geoffrey Fisher, D.D., Archbishop of Canterbury,
 Church of England.
 Rev. Bishop C. W. Flint, D.D., The Methodist Church, U.S.A.
 Rev. Professor G. Florovsky, Russian Orthodox Church.
 Rev. Jesse D. Franks, D.D., Southern Baptist Convention, U.S.A.
 Rt. Rev. Bishop H. Fuglsang-Damgaard, D.D., Church of Denmark.
 Rev. Dr. W. J. Gallagher, United Church of Canada.
 Rev. J. Bruce Gardiner, D.D., Presbyterian Church of South Africa.
 Rev. W. E. Garrison, D.D., Disciples of Christ in North America.
 Rev. Bishop S. L. Greene, D.D., African Methodist Episcopal
 Church, U.S.A.
 Rev. W. H. Greever, D.D., United Lutheran Church in America.
 Most Rev. John A. F. Gregg, Archbishop of Armagh, Church of
 Ireland.
 Most Rev. Dr. T. Grünberg, Archbishop of Latvia, Evangelical
 Lutheran Church of Latvia.
 Rev. E. G. Gulin, D.D., Lutheran Church of Finland.
 Rev. Prof. R. R. Hartford, D.D., Church of Ireland.
 Professor Ch. Hauter, Church of the Augsburg Confession in Alsace
 and Lorraine.
 Carl Heath, Society of Friends in Great Britain.
 Rev. J. P. Hickinbotham, Church of England.
 Rev. E. K. Higdon, B.D., Disciples of Christ of the Philippines.
 Konsistorialrat D. Hildt, United Evangelical Church of Poland.
 Rev. Bishop Ivan Lee Holt, D.D., The Methodist Church, U.S.A.
 Rev. Dr. J. T. Hornsby, Congregational Union of Scotland.
 Rev. Prof. J. L. Hromádka, Ph.D., Czech Brethren Evangelical
 Church.
 Most Rev. Archbishop Mattheos Indjeian, LL.D., D.D., Apostolic
 Church of Armenia.
 Rt. Rev. Irenäus, D.D., Bishop of Novi Sad, Orthodox Church of
 Serbia.
 Archpriest John Janson, Orthodox Church of Latvia.
 Ven. James Alexander Jermyn, B.A., Church of the Province of
 New Zealand.
 Rev. A. Wellesley Jones, B.D., Presbyterian Church in Wales.
 Rev. Edgar DeWitt Jones, D.D., Disciples of Christ in North
 America.
 Prof. D. Adolf Keller, D.D., Swiss Church Federation.
 Rev. Bishop Paul B. Kern, D.D., The Methodist Church, U.S.A.
 Professor W. J. Kooiman, Evangelical Lutheran Church of the
 Netherlands.
 Rt. Rev. Bishop Dr. Adolf Küry, Old Catholic Churches.
 Prof. Atkinson Lee, M.A., The Methodist Church of Great Britain.

Most Rev. Archbishop A. Lehtonen, Dr. Theol., Lutheran Church of Finland.
 Rev. Henry S. Leiper, D.D., General Council of the Congregational and Christian Churches, U.S.A.
 C. T. Le Quesne, K.C., Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland.
 Rev. Prof. Timothy Tingfang Lew, Ph.D., North China Kung-Li-Hui.
 Rev. Dr. Leicester C. Lewis, Protestant Episcopal Church, U.S.A.
 Dr. William B. Lippard, Northern Baptist Convention, U.S.A.
 Prof. Frederick W. Loetscher, D.D., Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.
 Rev. W. F. Lofthouse, D.D., The Methodist Church of Great Britain.
 Rev. Dr. Charles W. Lowry, Jr., Protestant Episcopal Church, U.S.A.
 C. J. Lucas, M.A., L.T., South India United Church.
 Rev. Canon Ibrahim Luka, Egyptian Orthodox (Coptic) Church.
 Rev. Bishop F. J. McConnell, D.D., The Methodist Church, U.S.A.
 Rev. Alexander McCrea, Methodist Church in Ireland.
 Rev. Dr. A. J. Macdonald, Church of England.
 Very Rev. R. G. Macintyre, C.M.G., O.B.E., D.D., Presbyterian Church in Australia.
 Rev. Dr. John A. Mackay, Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.
 Rev. J. McKenzie, D.D., United Church of North India.
 Rev. Homer McMillan, LL.D., Presbyterian Church in the United States.
 Prof. Adalbert Maksay, Reformed Church of Transylvania.
 Rt. Rev. Bishop William T. Manning, D.D., Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A.
 Rev. Prof. William Manson, D.D., Church of Scotland.
 Rev. Dr. John Marsh, Congregational Union of England and Wales.
 Rev. Hugh Martin, D.D., Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland.
 Pastor Pierre Maury, Reformed Church of France.
 Rt. Rev. Bishop Lakdasa De Mel, Church of India, Burma and Ceylon.
 Rev. Charles Clayton Morrison, D.D., Disciples of Christ in North America.
 Dr. John R. Mott, The Methodist Church, U.S.A.
 Rev. Epaminondas Moura, Methodist Church, Brazil.
 Most Rev. Nicolas, Metropolitan of Aksoum, Orthodox Patriarchate of Alexandria.
 Pastor Lic. Wilhelm Niesel, German Evangelical Church.
 Rev. D. T. Niles, Methodist Church of Ceylon.
 Rev. Paul Susumu Nishida, Kumiai Churches in Japan.
 Prof. Jens Nørregaard, D.D., Church of Denmark.
 Rt. Rev. Bishop G. Ashton Oldham, D.D., Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A.
 Rt. Rev. Bishop D. Ordass, Evangelical Lutheran Church in Hungary.
 Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, Methodist Church in the U.S.A.
 Rev. George L. Paik, Ph.D., Presbyterian Church of Korea.
 Rt. Rev. Bishop Edwin James Palmer, D.D., Church of England.
 Most Rev. Archbishop Panteleimon of Neapolis, Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem.
 Rt. Rev. Bishop Edward L. Parsons, D.D., Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A.
 Rev. E. A. Payne, B.Litt., Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland.

- Rev. Albert Peel, D.Litt., Congregational Union of England and Wales.
- Rev. Harold C. Phillips, D.D., Northern Baptist Convention, U.S.A.
- Very Rev. George C. Pidgeon, M.A., D.D.; United Church of Canada.
- Rev. Pascoal L. Pitta, Presbyterian Church in Brazil.
- Rt. Rev. Bishop D. H. B. Rahamägi, Evangelical Lutheran Church of Esthonia.
- Rt. Rev. A. E. J. Rawlinson, D.D., Bishop of Derby, Church of England.
- Pastor Lic. H. G. Renkewitz, Moravian Church.
- Ven. H. W. Rennison, Church of Ireland.
- Rev. G. W. Richards, D.D., Evangelical Reformed Church, U.S.A.
- Rev. Kenneth Riches, Church of England.
- Prof. Harold Roberts, M.A., Ph.D., Methodist Church of Great Britain.
- Principal William Robinson, M.A., D.D., Churches of Christ in Great Britain.
- Rev. Edgar F. Romig, D.D., Reformed Church in America.
- Dr. Elbert Russell, Society of Friends in the U.S.A. (Five Years' Meeting).
- Prof. D. Hermann Sasse, German Evangelical Church.
- Pastor Jean de Saussure, Swiss Church Federation.
- Prof. Edmund Schlink, German Evangelical Church.
- Rev. Bishop Charles C. Selecman, D.D., Methodist Church, U.S.A.
- Rt. Rev. Bishop Seraphim, Russian Orthodox Church in Exile.
- His Beatitude Eshai Mar Shimun XXIII, Catholicos Patriarch of the East, Assyrian Orthodox Church.
- Rt. Rev. Johannes Smemo, Bishop of Agder, Church of Norway.
- Dean W. L. Sperry, D.D., General Council of the Congregational and Christian Churches, U.S.A.
- Prof. D. Ernst Staehelin, Swiss Church Federation.
- Bischof D. Wilhelm Stählin, German Evangelical Church.
- Mrs. E. A. Stebbins, Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A.
- Most Rev. Stephan, D.D., Archbishop of Sofia, Orthodox Church of Bulgaria.
- Rev. Herman F. Swartz, D.D., General Council of the Congregational and Christian Churches, U.S.A.
- Rev. Canon Tissington Tatlow, D.D., Church of England.
- Rt. Rev. Mar Theodosius, O.I.C., Orthodox Church of Malabar.
- Rev. J. S. Ladd Thomas, D.D., The Methodist Church, U.S.A.
- Prof. Béla de Vasady, D.D., Reformed Church of Hungary.
- Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft, Swiss Church Federation.
- Rev. A. L. Warnshuis, D.D., Reformed Church in America.
- Rev. Dr. Howard Watkin-Jones, Methodist Church of Great Britain.
- Rev. Alan C. Watson, Presbyterian Church of New Zealand.
- Dr. Francis Wei, Chung Hua Sheng Kung Hui.
- Rev. A. R. Wentz, Ph. D., D.D., United Lutheran Church in America.
- Pastor Arnold Werner, Church of Sweden.
- Pastor Charles Westphal, Reformed Church of France.
- Prof. Joseph T. Wigham, M.D., Society of Friends in Ireland.
- Rt. Rev. Edward S. Woods, D.D., Bishop of Lichfield, Church of England.
- Rev. Chukichi Yasuda, Church of the United Brethren of Japan.
- Prof. Dr. J. de Zwaan, Reformed Church of the Netherlands.
- Together with
- One nominee of the Patriarch of the Orthodox Church of Rumania.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

Ex-officio Members.

THE RT. REV. BISHOP YNGVE T. BRILIOTH, *Chairman*.
THE RT. REV. BISHOP AULÉN, PASTOR MARC BOEGNER, REV. DR. R.
NEWTON FLEW, THE MOST REV. ARCHBISHOP GERMANOS, REV.
DR. DOUGLAS HORTON, *Vice-Chairmen*.
REV. O. S. TOMKINS, *Secretary*.
REV. DR. L. HODGSON, *Theological Secretary*.
REV. DR. F. W. TOMKINS, *Associate Secretary in America*.
REV. DR. W. A. VISSER 'T HOOFT, *General Secretary of the World
Council*.
THE CHAIRMEN, VICE-CHAIRMEN AND SECRETARIES OF THE
COMMISSIONS. (See below.)

Elected Members.

PROF. H. S. ALIVISATOS, D.D.
REV. DR. M. E. AUBREY.
BARON V. BOETZELAER V. DUBBELDAM.
BISCHOF D. DR. O. DIBELIUS.
RT. REV. BISHOP ANGUS DUN, D.D.
RT. REV. BISHOP FUGLSANG-DAMGAARD.
REV. D. T. NILES.
PROF. D. ERNST STAEHELIN.
DR. A. R. WENTZ.

THEOLOGICAL COMMISSIONS.

(i) The Church.

Chairman: REV. DR. R. NEWTON FLEW.
Vice-Chairman: PROF. DR. K. E. SKYDSGAARD.
Secretary: REV. KENNETH RICHES.

American Theological Committee.

Chairman: REV. PROF. CLARENCE T. CRAIG, D.D.
Secretary:

(ii) Ways of Worship.

Chairman: PROF. DR. G. VAN DER LEEUW.
Vice-Chairman: PASTOR DR. H. ASMUSSEN.
Secretaries: PROFESSOR W. J. KOOIMAN, MR. W. VOS.

(iii) Intercommunion.

A. American Section.

Chairman: REV. HUGH THOMSON KERR, D.D.
Secretary: REV. CHARLES W. LOWRY, Sc., Ph.D.

B. European Section.

Chairman: REV. PROFESSOR D. M. BAILLIE.
Vice-Chairman: PROF. H. S. ALIVISATOS.
Secretary: REV. DR. JOHN MARSH.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS.

The following publications may be obtained, without charge, from the Secretariat at 7, Kensington Church Court, London, W.8, England, or St. John's Rectory, Washington, Conn., U.S.A.

No.

55. REPORTS OF THE LAUSANNE CONFERENCE. 1927.
66. THE THEOLOGY OF GRACE: Report of the Committee of Theologians. 1931.
81. REPORT OF COMMISSION III ON THE MINISTRY AND SACRAMENTS. 1937.
82. REPORT I OF COMMISSION IV ON THE MEANINGS OF UNITY.
83. REPORT II OF COMMISSION IV ON THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS.
84. REPORT III OF COMMISSION IV ON NON-THEOLOGICAL FACTORS IN THE MAKING AND UN-MAKING OF CHURCH UNION.
85. REPORT V OF COMMISSION IV ON NEXT STEPS ON THE ROAD TO A UNITED CHURCH.
86. QUESTIONS PROPOSED FOR DISCUSSION BY SECTION IV OF THE 1937 (EDINBURGH) WORLD CONFERENCE.
87. REPORT OF COMMISSION II ON THE CHURCH OF CHRIST AND THE WORD OF GOD.
88. NOTES FOR THE USE OF SECTION I OF THE EDINBURGH (1937) CONFERENCE.
90. REPORT OF THE EDINBURGH CONFERENCE. 1937.
92. THE 1939 MEETING OF THE CONTINUATION COMMITTEE.
93. STATEMENTS RECEIVED FROM CHURCHES ON THE EDINBURGH REPORT (First Series).
94. STATEMENTS RECEIVED FROM CHURCHES (Second Series)
98. REPORT OF THE AMERICAN SECTION OF THE COMMISSION ON INTERCOMMUNION.
99. RULES AND CUSTOMS OF CHURCHES CONCERNING INTERCOMMUNION AND OPEN COMMUNION.
101. MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AT GENEVA, FEBRUARY, 1946.
102. THE 1947 MEETING OF THE CONTINUATION COMMITTEE.

The following may be ordered through any bookseller:

FAITH AND ORDER: PROCEEDINGS OF THE WORLD CONFERENCE, LAUSANNE, August 3-21, 1927. London: Student Christian Movement Press. Price 4s. (In America copies may be obtained from The World Conference Secretariat. Price, \$ 1.50.)

THE DOCTRINE OF GRACE. Edited by W. T. Whitley, LL.D.
London: Student Christian Movement Press; New York:
The Macmillan Company. Price, 15s.; \$ 4.50.

CONVICTIONS: A SELECTION FROM THE RESPONSES OF THE
CHURCHES TO THE REPORT OF THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON
FAITH AND ORDER. Edited by the Rev. Leonard Hodgson
with the assistance of the Very Rev. H. N. Bate and
Ralph W. Brown. London: Student Christian Movement
Press; New York: The Macmillan Company. Price,
8s. 6d.; \$ 3.

THE MINISTRY AND THE SACRAMENTS. Report of the Theo-
logical Commission appointed by the Continuation Com-
mittee of the Faith and Order Movement under the
Chairmanship of the Rt. Rev. A. C. Headlam, C.H., D.D.,
Bishop of Gloucester. Edited by the Rev. Roderic
Dunkerley, B.D., Ph.D. London: Student Christian
Movement Press. Price. 18s.

A DECADE OF OBJECTIVE PROGRESS IN CHURCH UNITY, 1927-
1936, Report No. 4 of the Commission on the Church's
Unity in Life and Worship. H. Paul Douglass, D.D.
New York: Harper & Brothers. \$ 1.50.

DIE KIRCHE CHRISTI UND DAS WORT GOTTES, Studienbuch
der 2. Theologischen Kommission. Herausgegeben von
General-superintendent D. Zoellner, Berlin, und Professor
D. Dr. Stählin, Münster. Furcheverlag. Kaufpreis RM.
4.0.

DAS GOTTLICHE GEHEIMNIS. Von Professor D. Dr. Wilhelm
Stählin, Münster. Johannes Stadauverlag, Kassel. Kauf-
preis R.M. 2.80.

THE MYSTERY OF GOD. Wilhelm Stählin. (A translation of
the above.) Student Christian Movement Press. London:
7s. 6d.

THE SECOND WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER,
EDINBURGH, 1937. Edited by Leonard Hodgson. Lon-
don: Student Christian Movement Press; New York: The
Macmillan Company. Price, 10s. 6d.; \$ 2.50.

FOI ET CONSTITUTION, Actes officiels de la Deuxième Con-
férence Universelle, Edimbourg, 3-18 août 1937. Version
française par Henri Clavier. Librairie Fischbacher, Paris,
1939. Prix 60 fr.

DAS GLAUBENSGESPRACH DER KIRCHEN: Die zweite Welt-
konferenz für Glauben und Kirchenverfassung. In deut-
scher Uebersetzung herausgegeben van Ernst Stähelin.
Evangelischer Verlag A-G. Zollikon-Zürich.

THE NATURE OF THE CHURCH. A Report of the American
Theological Committee. Willett, Clark and Co., Chicago,
75 ct.

